This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

HDI
HW 3606 N

25228.116 B

From the folklore collection formed by Lucy Orne Bowditch and Charles Pickering Bowditch presented to the
HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

FOLK-LORE RELICS OF EARLY VILLAGE LIFE.

FOLK-LORE RELICS

OF

EARLY VILLAGE LIFE.

BY

GEORGE LAURENCE GOMME, F.S.A.

Honorary Secretary of the Folk-Lore Society; Honorary Member of the Glasgow Archæological Society, of the Andalusian Folk-Lore Society, and of the Associação dos Jornalistas e Escriptores Portuguezes.

LONDON: ELLIOT STOCK,

62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1883.

25228.116
B
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

CONTENTS.

PREFACE	. . . . .	vii
CHAPTER I.	Introduction	1
II.	The Settlement of the Village . .	16
III.	The Foundation Sacrifice . . .	24
IV.	The Occupation of the Homeſtead .	59
V.	The Houſe-ſpirits	72
VI.	The Houſe-Gods as Gods of Agriculture	124
VII.	Early Domeſtic Cuſtoms . . .	152
VIII.	The Village Marriage . . .	185

PREFACE.

I DO not offer this book as a ſcientific expoſition of Folk-lore, though I hope the ſcientiſt will find nothing in it to quarrel with. I cannot pretend that the ſtudies on the ſubject which I now put forward are in all ways complete, or ſatisfying; but while I do not think that the folk-lore not included in my pages will deſtroy the argument I advance, I am quite aware that to deal properly with the ſubject it would be neceſſary to re-arrange and re-docket all the items of Folk-lore now exiſting in our goodly collections. This one day I hope to do: for the preſent I give a ſmall, and perhaps fragmentary inſtalment of a big ſubject.

I ſhould like, however, to ſay exactly how theſe ſtudies of mine meet the poſition I would claim for Folk-lore. Folk-lore I conceive to belong to a period of hiſtory when Engliſh ſocial life was repreſented by a net-work of independent ſelf-acting

village communities. It ſhould explain and illuſtrate this ſtage of ſociety, therefore. It ſhould take us into the homeſtead, the village, the farm, the arable lands, the paſtures, the foreſt boundary.

The preſent contribution to the ſubject, however, takes us no further than the village-home. It looks out into the ſurroundings, it is true, but it is only as diſtant landſcape when we are ſitting in the family circle liſtening to the tales of old times and old doings. I am not without hopes that I may be encouraged to make this diſtant landſcape as well known as I have ſought herein to make the village homes.

But in preſenting this half of the picture of the primitive village life as portrayed by Folk-lore, there are ſtill many gaps in the workmanſhip. To know what pieces of Engliſh Folk-lore are primitive, and what are modern ſuperſtition only, it is neceſſary to compare them with primitive cuſtoms and manners. This work of compariſon is a long and difficult taſk. I have, however, confined myſelf to ſome near parallels in the forms of the cuſtoms, and have not touched upon the leſs preciſe and more difficult compariſons of motif. Nor have I, except in one inſtance, gone into the important queſtion of the development of popular cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions. Thus many items of Engliſh Folk-lore are not to be found in the village-life I have depicted here. I know they have a place ſomewhere, except in reſpect of ſome branches of profeſſedly modern ſuperſtition, and I am proceeding with my work of bringing them to their new home. But I

FOLK-LORE RELICS OF EARLY VILLAGE LIFE.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

THE collection of popular antiquities and popular ſuperſtitions has been going on for ſome time. The work has been for the moſt part accompliſhed by the curious antiquary, who has jotted down his items of folk-lore, as we now term the ſtudy, and ſo preſerved them for whatſoever uſe they may ultimately be put. There has thus been got together a muſeum of popular antiquarian lore, each item docketed and placed according to the wiſdom of its collector. This muſeum contains ſuch collections as John Aubrey's "Gentiliſme and Judaiſme," written in 1686-87, Sir Thomas Browne's "Vulgar Errors," Bourn and Brand's "Popular Antiquities," Henderſon's "Folk-lore of the Northern Counties," and the hoſt of other books which have followed up theſe pre-

curſors of our ſtudy. It is a goodly muſeum, this great collection of folk-lore, and it repreſents very nearly the whole contribution of Great Britain to the ſubject.

Having thus pointed out the exiſtence of our great muſeum of popular antiquities, the queſtion comes to the ſtudent of primitive culture—is not all this valuable to the scientific inquirer: is there not a ſcientific, as well as an antiquarian, value attached to theſe items of folk-lore? Well, this queſtion alſo has been anſwered to ſome extent. The modern folkloriſt is not content with the collection of merely Engliſh or Scotch items of folk-lore, Engliſh or Scotch fairy tales; he muſt go further afield and find out parallels in other European countries, becauſe he knows beforehand that the ſcience of language and the ſcience of comparative politics have declared the inhabitants of Europe to be the deſcendants of one branch of the great Aryan family, and he juſtly concludes that if folk-lore is of any value at all for the elucidation of the unwritten hiſtory of the paſt it muſt go back to the times when the European family was united. Still this work of compariſon has only been fitfully accompliſhed—from the nature of things, perhaps, it could not be otherwiſe, and the reſult is that we have collections of Engliſh folk-lore annotated with parallels to the folk-lore of other countries, but not otherwiſe lifted out of the elementary ſtage of collection. I am not ſaying this ſhould be otherwiſe with the books that we have already upon our ſhelves—their work has been the work of

collection, the work of adding to our museum items which, but for these collectors, might have perished for ever.

We reach another stage in the progress of English folk-lore studies when we arrive at Mr. Kelly's "Curiosities of Indo-European Tradition and Folk-lore," published in 1863. Here the great results of Grimm's work in Germany are summarized and placed before the student. This new school have made it their task to trace back the traditional beliefs and popular customs of ancient and modern Europe to their common source.[1] Thus the base of operations is again widened. From isolated English folk-lore we first launched out into European folk-lore, and now we arrive at Indo-European, or Aryan, folk-lore.

But there is yet another stage of comparative folk-lore, a stage at which the base of operations is still further widened from Aryan life into primitive life as illustrated by modern savages. It is well known that Mr. Tylor in his magnificent work on "Primitive Culture" has placed English and European superstitions and popular customs side by side with savage rites and customs. They both fit so well in their places in the restored picture of primitive culture, that their right to stand thus in the science of *Sociology* cannot be questioned. It is not questioned. It is accepted as a great scientific fact by those who are interested in learning something about the beginnings of civilization.

"Survival in culture," says Mr. Tylor, "placing

[1] Kelly's "Indo-European Folk-Lore," preface, page vi.

all along the courſe of advancing civilization way-marks full of meaning to thoſe who can decipher their ſigns, even now ſets up in our midſt primæval monuments of barbaric thought and life. Its inveſtigation tells ſtrongly in favour of the view that the European may find among the Greenlanders or Maoris many a trace for reconſtructing the picture of his own primitive anceſtors."[1] Mr. A. Lang has put the matter ſtill more ſtrongly from a purely folk-lore point of view, and I muſt be pardoned for transferring from his preface to the "Folk-lore Record," vol. ii., words which better explain the ſubject I am anxious to explain than any I could uſe. "Setting aſide the accidents of folk-lore," ſays Mr. Lang, "we find the great maſs of the more eſſential popular cuſtoms and beliefs exiſting in almoſt identical ſhape, among peoples modern and ancient, peoples barbarous and civilized, peoples of the eaſtern and the weſtern hemiſpheres, and of the Auſtralian continent. Now when we find widely and evenly diſtributed on the earth's ſurface the rude flint tools of men, we regard theſe as the oldeſt examples of human ſkill. Are we not equally juſtified in regarding the widely and evenly diſtributed beliefs in ghoſts, kelpies, fairies, wild women of the foreſts (which are preciſely the ſame in Brittany as in New Caledonia), as among the oldeſt examples of the working of human fancy? And, to go a ſtep further, is not the nurſery-tale which you find among Celts, Germans, Baſques, Bechuanas, Aztecs, and Egyptians, obviouſly a relic of human imagi-

[1] "Primitive Culture," i., 19.

nation, conſtructed in an age when people now civilized were in the ſame intellectual condition as people ſtill ſavage? The flint arrow-head picked up from a Britiſh camp is like that which is buried with an Algonquin chief, or which is diſcovered in Egyptian ſoil, or on the plain of Marathon, or which tips the reed of a modern Samoyed.[1] Again, the popular tales of modern Samoyeds are often obviouſly related in plot and incident to, and identical in tone and ſtyle with, thoſe which are deci-

[1] I muſt quote one illuſtration of Mr. Lang's ſtatement. "A paper was read at the *ſoirée* of the Hiſtoric Society, at the cloſe of laſt year's [1854] meeting of the Britiſh Aſſociation in Liverpool, by Mr. Wright, upon the Fauſſett antiquities—a collection made by the Rev. Bryan Fauſſett, of Heppington, near Canterbury, and which had been gathered from the graves of our forefathers, who exiſted in this country in a pre-hiſtoric period. Mr. Wright obſerves: 'In the caſe of a man we almoſt always find above the right ſhoulder the iron head of a ſpear; and in general we may trace, by the colour of the earth, the decayed wood of the ſhaft, until near the foot of the ſkeleton lies the iron-ſpiked ferule which terminated it at the other end. We ſometimes meet with one or more ſmaller heads of javelins or arrows. Cloſer to the ſide of the ſkeleton lies uſually a long iron broad-ſword, not much unlike the claymore of the Scottiſh Highlanders, of which it is probably the type'—the very weapons of warfare that are at this day uſed by all the Filatah nations with whom we came in contact on our voyage—the ſpear with its iron-ſpiked ferule, the javelins and arrows of different patterns in their blades, and the double-edged Houſſa ſword, manufactured by themſelves, amongſt tribes who never until our recent viſit looked on the face of an European, and could not have received inſtructions in armoury fabrication from any ſo-called civilized nation."—Hutchinson's *Narrative of the Niger*, pp. 75-6, 1855.

phered from Egyptian papyri, or are embedded in the Vedas, or are collected from the lips of Baſques in the Pyrenees, Germans in the Black Foreſt, Celts in Barra, Zulus by the Buffalo River. To return to the analogy of the arrow-heads, how is the eſſential identity in form of the Britiſh, the Red Indian, the Greek, the Egyptian flint arrow-head, explained? Obviouſly by the ſimple fact that on Engliſh, American, Greek, and Egyptian ſoil there once exiſted races as ſimple, and as neceſſarily driven to the uſe of ſtone implements, as are the modern ſavages, who ſtill uſe tools of flint. No one will ſay that people, after acquiring the art of uſing metals, will prefer to reſort as a general rule to the employment of ſtone. No; the arrow-heads in the ground atteſt the ancient preſence of barbariſm on Greek, Engliſh, and Egyptian ſoil. Let us turn again to the fairy-tales. I am anxious to make out a parallel between them and the arrow-heads. I conceive that they are ſavage and early in character, that in ſtyle and type of incident they bear the marks of ſavage fancy as clearly as the arrow-head bears the marks of the rude ſtone hammer. And I conclude that many popular tales among Greeks, ancient and modern, Egyptians, Vedic Aryans, Baſques, Celts, Germans, are juſt as plainly relics and ſurvivals of the ſavage ſtage of fancy as the flint arrow-heads in European ſoil, and the rude clay pipkins of Celtic graves and of the modern cotters in the Hebrides, are relics and ſurvivals of ſavage art and manufacture."

My taſk in the preſent caſe is a much ſimpler and

more humble one than that ſketched out by the graphic pen of Mr. Lang. All that I propoſe doing is to travel in his company and in that of Mr. Tylor for a ſhort diſtance of their journey and with a much lighter load. Inſtead of taking with me the folk-lore of all Europe and going into the homes and lands of ſavages, I propoſe taking only the folk-lore of England; and when I have ſecured my ſmall ſtock of compariſons, I propoſe ſhowing how this journey of mine has been equal to a journey backward through all the ſtages of Engliſh civilization to a time when the inhabitants of this iſland belonged to the claſs of primitive man who would have ſupplied Roman or Greek inquirers with the ſelf-ſame knowledge that the modern inquirer obtains from modern ſavages. To put the whole queſtion ſhortly in its hiſtorical aſpect, I would ſay that by comparing Engliſh and German cuſtoms we arrive at a Teutonic ſtage of early life; take into this field the Scandinavian, the Celtic, and the Hindoo groups, and we arrive at an Aryan ſtage; take in yet earlier groups, and we come upon a thoroughly primitive ſtage of political and ſocial life, the records of which are of ineſtimable value to the ſtudent of man and his works. Leaving for abler hands the taſk of this wide field of comparative ſtudy, I keep for the moſt part to the two ends of the ſubject, the Engliſh end and the ſavage end, and try by this means to indicate ſome loſt facts of early village life in Britain. I do not ſay it is Teutonic life, or early European life, or Aryan life, but ſimply that it is primitive life and may belong to any one or all

of the ethnological groups to which Engliſh inſtitutions belong.

I want ſpecially to guard againſt one miſapprehenſion that might ariſe from my mode of dealing with the ſubject. I do not pretend to have taken into conſideration the whole corpus of Engliſh folk-lore. When all my compariſons are made, it will be found that there remains a great quantity of folk-lore not included in my ſtudies of primitive life in Britain as brought to light by this ſhort treatiſe on comparative folk-lore. That I have not dealt with this unworked material does not mean to ſay that it cannot be dealt with hereafter, but ſimply that for preſent purpoſes it has not been included in the ſmall ſection of the ſubject with which I have begun. On the other hand, it muſt not be ſuppoſed that all the folk-lore not included by me is a relic of primitive life; becauſe it can well be conceived, and indeed proved, that civilized people produce a growth of popular ſuperſtition within their own ſociety, juſt as ſavage people do. The idea that it is unlucky to go under a ladder, for inſtance, is a ſuperſtition belonging to civilized ſociety, baſed no doubt upon the primitive conception of things, but diſtinctly in form and meaning of modern origin. Still all this unworked material has a place of its own, and muſt be reckoned with in the final reſults of a ſtudy of comparative folk-lore. There are many obſtacles to a complete aſſortment of folk-lore into primitive and non-primitive ſections. Particularly is this ſo when taking as the baſis of operations the folk-lore of one particular country, like Britain in the

preſent caſe. The proof of ſimilarity with ſavage cuſtom cannot always be given, becauſe we may not poſſeſs any means of making the direct compariſon. Folk-lore has developed in form and meaning juſt as language and law have. To be able to identify every item of folk-lore with its primitive original we muſt proceed backwards through, it may be, long lines of tranſitional forms. This labour may be obviated in many inſtances by enlarging the baſis of the civilized group of folk-lore from an excluſive national group, like that of Great Britain in the preſent caſe, to a continental group; becauſe the proceſs of ſocial development has affected particular branches of popular ſuperſtition differently in different countries—in one country it may have left its primitive form almoſt intact, in another it may have completely altered it. Thus a cuſtom or ſuperſtition in England may be quite different from anything we know of in ſavage life, until we come to ſee how this ſelf-ſame cuſtom is repreſented in German or Scandinavian folk-lore, where it is often preſerved in a more original form; or the converſe of this may be the caſe. All this work comes into the department of comparative folk-lore. But for the preſent I have contented myſelf with dealing with direct analogies; firſt, becauſe they give a tolerably complete picture without any ſerious blemiſhes in the detail or in the outline; ſecondly, becauſe I have laboured to be as conciſe and clear as poſſible in preſenting for the firſt time a ſtudy of folk-lore relics of primitive life in Britain.

The many connections which exiſt between Eng-

liſh folk-lore and ſavage cuſtom have not been placed fairly before the ſtudent of Engliſh antiquities. When they exiſt in literature, they exiſt only by accident, as it were, not in any ſpecified grouping, not in any hiſtorical aſpect. It ſeems to me, however, that it is well worth while to make ſome reſearches into this curious ſubject, perhaps not ſo much from an Engliſh-hiſtory point of view ſimply, as from an anthropological point of view as well. The ſurvival of primitive amidſt civilized life, the connection between ſavage man and civilized man, is ſeen at a greater advantage from this narrower ſphere of reſearch. But ſtill the greateſt advantage will be to the ſtudent of Engliſh antiquities—it will make him think of their value from a new point of view altogether, and it will teach him new leſſons from his old inſtitutions and old cuſtoms and habits.

Before proceeding to our taſk, I have a word to ſay upon the general queſtion of the claſſification of folk-lore. At preſent we ſeem to be content with a haphazard arrangement baſed upon the peculiarity of each cuſtom and its place in modern ideas. But ſurely all this is wrong upon ſcientific grounds. Inſtead of claſſifying cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions according to their own facility for literary arrangement, or according to the modern ideas of births, deaths, marriages, domeſtic life, fairies, and ſo on, we ſhould firſt of all appeal to thoſe ſtudies which have dealt with the ſocial formations of primitive man, and map out from thence a general arrangement of primitive ſociety, within which to include the folk-lore belongings of the primitive ſocial

group. Archæology will tell us all about the primitive village, its huts and its lands. Comparative politics will tell us all about the reciprocal rights and duties of villager to villager, and the modes of exiſtence. And what the folkloriſt has to do, is to add his contribution to theſe departments of knowledge. Modern folk-lore was the cuſtom of primitive ſociety, and it muſt have been prevalent within the village and alongſide all the facts of village life. It thus helps our view of the general aſpect of primitive life in Britain. To pick out an iſolated ſavage cuſtom, and compare it with Engliſh cuſtom, without reference to the ſtate of ſociety to which this cuſtom belonged, is to tell only half a tale, and that perhaps in a wrong way, baſed upon wrong foundations, and leading to wrong concluſions. But to learn that this compariſon has given us back again one of the loſt items of village life in Britain; to learn that we ſee once more the action of a villager in his outlying plot of arable land, in his paſture grounds, in his aſſembly, in his own houſehold, is to re-kindle life amidſt the archæological objects which without this knowledge are lifeleſs enough.

With only archæology to help us, the mud huts or cave dwellings are untenanted; the flint implements, the ornaments, the domeſtic utenſils are ownerleſs; the graves have no aſſociations beyond the ſkeleton remains. The agricultural work is mapped out by the aid of comparative politics, but we ſee and know nothing of the workman. The old-world gods are ſet up on their pedeſtals; but the worſhippers and all the outpourings of their

minds are but dimly ſeen far in the background. But guided by comparative folk-lore we may once more reſtore life into this deſolated region, becauſe we can once more get at ſome of the thoughts and fancies which accompanied the inhabitants of the primitive village throughout the ſeveral ſtages of their daily routine.

During the progreſs of our reſearches I ſhall more definitely point out to what particular branch of early village life the different items of folk-lore of modern England belong. But in order to give ſome idea at the outſet of the kind of ſocial group with which we ſhall find ourſelves intereſted, I will here briefly ſketch an outline of a typical village community as it exiſts in India and other primitive lands, and as it is known to have exiſted in England and the weſtern world. So far as the following pages are concerned, we deal with one portion only of this primitive community—the village itſelf and the village homeſtead. We do not get beyond the boundary of the village, but in the following ſhort deſcription I include all the main features of houſe, and village, and lands.

The main features of the primitive village community may be thus broadly arranged: firſt, the incloſed habitations of the people, afterwards known as the village or tún, town. This repreſents the centre-point from which iſſued all the rights over the adjacent territory, and in the community; each family of villagers has there its homeſtead, houſe, courtyard, farm buildings,[1] and, according to Naſſe,

[1] Stubb's "Conſt. Hiſt.," i., 49.

as much land as was requiſite to form a garden, kitchen-garden, and for flax and other culture which required a conſtant protection.[1] All this formed an incloſed ſpot ſacred againſt all comers, the home which came to be popularly called an Engliſhman's caſtle, the firſt ſtep in the hiſtory of real property law. Then come the common lands, over which the villagers have only cultivating rights, according to rules determined upon at the common aſſembly of the people. This aſſembly, formed of the elders of the people, is repreſented in early European hiſtory by a non-development of the primitive inſtitutions, and in modern Europe by a wealth of curious ſurvivals of primitive inſtitutions. It is beſt repreſented by what we find in Ruſſia, Switzerland, and elſewhere. In Ruſſia the aſſembly of inhabitants of the commune determines the time of ſowing and harveſt.[2] In Switzerland, all the commoners above the age of eighteen aſſemble, of abſolute right, every year, in April, to receive the report of accounts, and to regulate current affairs.[3] In Germany the inhabitants aſſembled to deliberate on all that concerned the cultivation, and to determine the order and time of the various agricultural operations.[4] In Holland, the partners in the work met once a year, on St. Peter's day, in a general aſſembly, or *holting*. They appeared in arms; and no one could abſent himſelf, under pain of a fine. This aſſembly directed all the details as to the enjoyment of the

[1] Naſſe, "Agric. Commun.," p. 17.
[2] Laveleye's "Primitive Property," p. 14.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 94. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 111.

common property; appointed the works to be executed; impoſed pecuniary penalties for the violation of rules, and nominated the officers charged with the executive power. The mound where the *holting* met (Malenpol) is ſtill viſible in Heldermalenveld, and at Spoolderberg, near Zwolle.[1]

Round the village are the incloſed graſs-lands, for the rearing of calves, &c.; round this the arable land for three crops; then the meadow ground for hay harveſt; then the ſtinted paſture lands; and, finally, the wooded paſture, in primitive times the foreſt or mark boundaries of the whole community.[2]

Individual ownerſhip in land is not recognized. In the typical village communities of Germany, the land is the property of the village as a corporate body. Individuals only acquire the uſe of a certain portion for a limited period. Each family or houſehold has allotted to it a ſtrip of the arable land, and poſſeſſes the rights of grazing cattle, drawing water, and hewing wood in the paſture lands, river, and wood. But at the end of a certain period—three, five, or ſeven years—the arable land is again caſt into one common lot, and a new diviſion is made, giving each houſehold a ſtrip equal in extent, but different in ſituation, to the former ſtrip, and ſo dividing equally the uſe of fertile and ſterile land among the villagers.[3]

[1] Laveleye's "Primitive Property," pp. 283, 284.

[2] See Naſſe, p. 17, and "Eſſay on the Land Tenure of Germany," by R. B. D. Morier, Cobden Club Eſſays, 1st ſeries.

[3] Mr. Fenton here gives an admirable ſummary from many ſources. See "Early Hebrew Life," pp. 30, 31.

Then what I have to aſk my readers to do, is to accompany me to theſe primitive villages of Britain. We ſhall there ſee ſome of the rites performed upon the foundation of the homeſtead; we ſhall ſee how ſacred the houſe was in the minds of primitive men; we ſhall peep into the houſe and ſee many of the domeſtic uſages that went on from day to day; we ſhall liſten to ſome of the ſtories that were told, and ſee how theſe ſtories are but a reflex of what was going on around the narrators; and, finally, we ſhall take part in ſome of their village cuſtoms. The one cardinal fact we muſt bear in mind is that this primitive village is a community of cuſtoms and intereſts; if within the family individuals poſſeſs rights of their own, outſide of this in all the means of exiſtence everything is in common, one is not rich and another poor, one does not poſſeſs more knowledge of domeſtic joys and comforts than another—the individual, in ſhort, is the child of the community, and as ſuch obeys the unwritten laws and uſages which declare that everything perſonal muſt give way to the village.

CHAPTER II.

THE SETTLEMENT OF THE VILLAGE.

TAKING up the general position as foreſhadowed in the introductory chapter, we firſt deal with the village homeſtead, from which iſſues all the individual rights of the community, and around which is ſituated all the cultivated lands and the outlying waſtes of the village. The homeſtead in ſhort is the centre-point from which all elſe ſtarts.

When a primitive tribe of people, either migrating to a new land altogether, or a primitive family group breaking off from a parent ſtem to make a clearing in the foreſt for itſelf, fixed upon the ſpot moſt advantageous for ſettlement, the firſt thing to be done was the foundation of the homeſtead. This was an important matter to the mind of primitive man, becauſe every locality was the home of and was protected by its ſpecial deities. This early faith has given riſe to the formulating in India of a written treatiſe upon the duties of builders, who muſt firſt aſcertain by accurate meaſurement the exact poſition of Vaſthû-puruſha

—the God of the Earth.[1] We have here the commencement of a large claſs of ancient faiths, namely, thoſe attaching to foreſt deities, hill deities, land deities, and the like. Theſe faiths are very general. They form, in fact, a section of the wide ſtudy of fairy lore. Without, however, going deeply into this, I muſt give one or two examples of theſe local deities in illuſtration of what I ſhall have to ſay hereafter. Everywhere the hills are the abode of fairies. Even in Polyneſia we learn that wherever the Ngatoro aſcended a hill, he left marks there to ſhow that he claimed it; the marks he left were fairies.[2] Trees alſo occupy a conſpicuous place in all religious ſyſtems—Chineſe, Hindu, Perſian, Arabian, Babylonian, and Aſſyrian. In our own land when an oak is being felled, before it falls it ſhrieks and groans, "as if," ſays Aubrey, "it were the genius of the oake lamenting."[3] In Teutonic mythology this is repreſented more poſitively. "Temple means alſo wood," ſays Grimm; "what we figure to ourſelves as a built and walled houſe reſolves itſelf, the farther back we go, into a holy place untouched by human hand, embowered and ſhut in by ſelf-grown trees. There dwells the deity, veiling his form in ruſtling foliage of the boughs."[4] In India, again, the belief in foreſt deities is very prevalent, and all wood-cutters make

[1] "Indian Antiquary," v. 230.

[2] Grey's "Polyneſian Mythology," p. 155.

[3] Aubrey's "Gentiliſme and Judaiſme," edit. Britten, p. 247. Cf. Denny's "Folklore of China," p. 47.

[4] Grimm's "Teutonic Mythology," p. 69.

ſacrifices to them.[1] In Polyneſian mythology we have the ſame idea fully repreſented. It is related how Rata went to the foreſt, and having found a very tall tree he felled it and cut off its noble branching top, intending to faſhion the trunk into a canoe; and all the inſects which inhabit trees and the ſpirits of the foreſts were angry at this . . . and they all came and took the tree and raiſed it up again.[2] And in Africa Livingſtone relates that while "the Balonda were ſtill building their village, they had found time to erect two little ſheds at the chief dwelling in it, in which were placed two pots having charms in them. When aſked what medicine they contained, they replied 'Medicine for the Barimo'; but when I roſe and looked into them they ſaid they were medicine for the game."[3]

Now what we muſt conclude from this wide-ſpread phaſe of belief is that the ſpots where the primitive homeſtead was to be built were fully guarded by the ſpirit-world. This is then the firſt ſtep towards re-arranging in archaic ſequence our ſcattered items of folk-lore, for it helps us to underſtand what the foundation of a home-ſtead really was. In our own land we can hardly realize that at one time the villages that are now marked on our maps commenced their exiſtence as a temporary reſidence almoſt of a family or clan. We all know Mr. Kemble's very fine picture of how theſe ſettlements began:—"On the natural clearings

[1] Cf. Hunter's "Statiſtical Account of Bengal," i., 312.

[2] Grey's "Polyneſian Mythology," p. 111.

[3] Livingſtone's "South Africa," p. 275.

in the foreſt, or on ſpots prepared by man for his own uſes; in valleys bounded by gentle acclivities which poured down fertilizing ſtreams; or on plains which here and there roſe, clothed with verdure, above ſurrounding marſhes; ſlowly and ſtep by ſtep, the warlike coloniſts adopted the habits and developed the character of peaceful agriculturiſts. All over England there ſoon exiſted a network of communities, the principle of whoſe being was ſeparation, as regarded each other; the moſt intimate union as reſpected the individual members of each."[1] How theſe communities ſpread and ſent forth daughter-communities over the land, muſt be learnt from Mr. Kemble's own pages. But juſt let us ſtep for one moment to another land, where the communities have not yet become thoroughly ſettled, where cultivation means a periodical ſhifting of the village and not a periodical ſhifting of the lands. Here the buſineſs of ſettlement is not the great event of an era but the ordinary event of a year or ſo; and thus we get a ſtage further back into primitive ſociety. Among the wild tribes of Southern India, the ſite of the village is changed as often as the ſpots fit for cultivation in the vicinity are exhauſted. Mr. Lewin, deſcribing the departure of a tribe to another ſite, ſays: "I have ſometimes met a hill community as they were changing their reſidence; long files of men, women, and children, every ſoul of the village, in fact, proceed to their new place of abode, each one with a long circular

[1] Kemble's "Saxons in England," i., pp. 65, 70. Cf. Laveleye's "Primitive Property," p. 34.

baſket ſlung at their backs and ſupported by a broad ſtrip of ſoft bark paſſing over the forehead. In ſome of the baſkets are their houſehold goods; in others a child and a young pig ſleep contentedly together. In the old village they have left behind perhaps half their property, and this without fear, as there are no thieves in the hills. They have gone probably a long diſtance (two days' journey) to the new ſite of the village; and on arriving there, every family has to build its own houſe."[1]

Now theſe primitive wanderings from place to place, either in their earlieſt ſtage, when the villagers followed the courſe of cultivation, or at later ſtages where a wholeſale migration of tribes from one land to another took place, or at a ſtill later ſtage where branches from an over-populated community went forth into the waſte and foreſt to find new homes, were accompanied by ſome elements of the ſpirit world—the anceſtral ſpirit of the tribe.

I will but give one piece of evidence of the migration of the tribal ſpirit with the tribe, and this comes from the Zulus and is complete in all its aſpects. Dr. Callaway gives us the following remarkable ſtory in his invaluable collection of Zulu Folk-lore:—"When we are about to go to another country, if the people do not ſee the Itongo at the new village, it having ſtaid behind, a branch of umpafa is cut, and perhaps they take a bullock with them, and go to ſacrifice it at the old ſite; they give thanks and call on the Itongo, and ſing three ſongs which he uſed to ſing whilſt living; this is a ſign of

[1] Lewin's "Wild Races of S. E. India," pp. 31, 40.

weeping for him, to excite pity, ſo that he may ſay, 'Truly my children are lonely becauſe they do not ſee me.' And the branch is dragged when they ſet out, and they go with it to the new village. Perhaps the ſnake follows; perhaps it refuſes, giving reaſons why it does not wiſh to go to that place, ſpeaking to the eldeſt ſon in a dream; or it may be to an old man of the village; or the old queen." [1]

This is a graphic picture enough. It takes us to the very beginnings of ſocial life. I muſt, however, add two more ſcraps of information upon this opening ſection of our ſubject before proceeding further. What I want to add, is the evidence of the communal nature of theſe ſettlements. It is not a caſe of each man for himſelf, but it is eſſentially a caſe of every man for the community at large.

In Hawaii, when a chief wants a houſe, he requires the labour of all who hold lands under him; and, ſays Mr. Ellis, "we have often been ſurpriſed at the diſpatch with which a houſe is ſometimes built. We have known the natives come with their materials in the morning, put up the frame of a middling-ſized houſe in one day, cover it the next, and on the third day return to their lands. Each diviſion of the people has a part of the houſe allotted by the chief in proportion to its number; and it is no unuſual thing to ſee upwards of a hundred men at a time working on one houſe." [2] The ſame cuſtom

[1] "The Religious Syſtem of the Amazulu," by Dr. Callaway, part ii., p. 212.

[2] Ellis, "Miſſionary Tour through Hawaii," p. 292.

of claiming the aſſiſtance of the community in the building of the houſe is found among the Hindoos, and here it is not limited to the chief's reſidence.[1] And in Scotland we have the ſelf-ſame cuſtom extant till within very recent times. The farm-houſes in general, and all the cottages at Dornock in Dumfrieſshire are built of mud or clay. The manner of erecting them is ſingular. In the firſt place they dig out the foundation of the houſe, and lay a row or two of ſtones; then they procure, from a pit contiguous, as much clay or brick earth as is ſufficient to form the walls; and, having provided a quantity of ſtraw or other litter to mix with the clay, upon a day appointed the whole neighbourhood, male and female, to the number of twenty or thirty, aſſemble, each with a dung-fork, a ſpade, or ſome ſuch inſtrument. Some fall to the working the clay or mud by mixing it with ſtraw; others carry the materials, and four or ſix of the moſt experienced hands build and take care of the walls. In this manner the walls of the houſe are finiſhed in a few hours; after which they retire to a good dinner and plenty of drink which is provided for them, when they have muſic and a dance, with which and other marks of feſtivity, they conclude the evening. This is called a daubing.[2]

The ſame thing ſurvives in England in a very inſtructive form, namely, in connection with the formation of a new homeſtead. A manorial cuſtom

[1] "Aſiatic Reſearches," xvii., p. 398; alſo cf. Lewin's "Wild Races of S. E. India," pp. 120, 252.

[2] Sinclair's "Stat. Acc. of Scot.," ii., p. 22.

in Lancaſhire and ſome parts of Cumberland compels the lord of the manor to grant a piece of ground for a houſe and garden to a newly-married tenant. All the friends of the bride and bridegroom aſſemble on the wedding-day, and ſet to work to conſtruct a dwelling for the young couple, of clay and wood.[1]

[1] Hampſon's "Medii Ævi Kalendarium," i., p. 289. Compare the Turkoman cuſtom, "Journ. Ethnol. Soc." i., p. 75.

CHAPTER III.

THE FOUNDATION SACRIFICE.

THIS ſhort indication of the proceſs of ſettlements of the primitive village, clears the way to an underſtanding of what follows after, for it is neceſſary in all caſes to approach our ſubject at each ſtage from a ſtandpoint in primitive life, and not from theories formed by the facts of civilized life. We come now to a conſideration of the foundation ſacrifice. And it is to be obſerved that the neceſſity for propitiating the ſpirit of the locality commences one of the moſt extraordinary chapters of comparative folk-lore which I ſhall be able to relate during theſe reſearches. We find the foundation ſacrifice among the loweſt races of mankind, and in modern Europe. Originally it ſtands as a houſe-cuſtom, that is, it is practiſed by the communal owners of every houſe in the village. Subſequently, in the caſes where human ſacrifice is kept up, it appears to have been limited to the chief houſe, or a great building, or the gates of the city. But in caſes

where a ſubſtitution for human ſacrifice has become the practice, we find that the cuſtom is diſtinctly a houſe-cuſtom. All this is very curious in the interpretation of the village life of primitive man. It leads us at once to the root of much that is otherwiſe incomprehenſible in his nature, in his thoughts, and in his fears. How clearly this cuſtom ſtands at the very baſis of the exiſtence of the primitive village I hope to ſhow later on, but we will firſt trace out the facts of the foundation ſacrifice as they are revealed to us by the aid of comparative folk-lore.

Commencing with the loweſt forms of the ſavage cuſtom, we have one or two very remarkable examples which have already been uſed by Mr. Tylor.

In Borneo, among the Milanau Dayaks, at the erection of the largeſt houſe, a deep hole was dug to receive the firſt poſt, which was then ſuſpended over it; a ſlave girl was placed in the excavation; at a ſignal the laſhings were cut, and the enormous timber deſcended, cruſhing the girl to death, a ſacrifice to the ſpirits.[1]

In Great Baſſam and Yarriba ſuch ſacrifices were uſual at the foundation of a houſe or village;[2] and perhaps the cuſtom of burying children in the floor of their houſes among the Sandwich Iſlanders may be traced to the ſame idea of foundation ſacrifices.[3]

In theſe inſtances a human ſacrifice is made at the foundation of a houſe. It would appear, therefore, that we may properly place theſe as the moſt primitive forms, firſt, becauſe the firſt ſtage of houſehold

[1] Tylor's "Primitive Culture," i., p. 96. [2] *Ibid.*
[3] Ellis, "Miſſionary Tour through Hawaii," p. 302.

life began, no doubt, with one houſe only for the accommodation of all the villagers; ſecondly, becauſe the examples we ſhall have next to mention belong clearly to a ſtage when the cluſter of houſes has made ſome progreſs towards a village. The mention of the cuſtom amongſt the Dayaks is particularly valuable, becauſe theſe people inhabit large houſes which contain the whole tribe.[1]

Theſe earlieſt forms of the cuſtom develop in two directions—the one having the victim of the ſacrifice varied, the other, the building for which the ſacrifice was made.

Under the firſt heading we have the example of the Quop Dayaks, the chief of whom ſets up a flagſtaff near his houſe, a chicken being thrown in to be cruſhed by the deſcending pole.[2] And it is a remarkable coincidence that in France the cuſtom has ſurvived as a houſe-cuſtom through the medium of this ſame ſubſtituted ſacrifice. In a diſtrict of Normandy (La Neuville Chant d'Oiſel), a newly-built houſe muſt be purified by the ſlaughter of a cock, the blood of which was ſhed upon the threſhold. Should this ceremony be neglected, the tenant was ſure to die in the courſe of the year.[3]

[1] "Journ. of the Geographical Soc.," xvi., p. 298. The ſame thing is incidental to American Indian tribes. See "Contributions to American Ethnology," i., p. 215; Bancroft, i., 718.

[2] Tylor's "Primitive Culture," i., p. 97.

[3] "Melusine," i., p. 11. M. Baudry, the narrator, was eye-witneſs of ſuch a ſacrifice about fifteen years ago. See alſo p. 73, where another cuſtom is deſcribed, according to which "on doit tuer un poulet (ou une autre volaille) et le faire ſaigner dans toutes les parties de la maiſon."

Dr. Hyde Clarke ſays this cuſtom is Arabic, and has alſo been adopted by the Turks.[1]

Then from New Zealand another example comes. Mr. Taylor ſays:—"The verandah (of the houſe where food was taken) is ornamented in the ſame way as the interior of the houſe. Its wall-plate is often carved to repreſent proſtrate figures of ſlaves, on whoſe bodies the pillars which ſupport the houſe ſtand; this ſeems to refer to an extinct cuſtom of killing human victims, and placing them in the holes made to receive the poſts, that the houſe, being founded in blood, might ſtand; the cuſtom ſtill prevails in Borneo and other parts."[2]

Under the ſecond heading there is a large group of very inſtructive examples, bringing us into contact with ſpecial buildings of the village or town, as diſtinct from the houſe, and again ſhowing a ſubſtitution of animal for human ſacrifices.

"In Africa, in Galam, a boy and girl uſed to be buried alive before the great gate of the city to make it impregnable, a practice once executed on a large ſcale by a Bambarra tyrant."[3]

"In Polyneſia, Ellis heard of the cuſtom, inſtanced by the fact, that the central pillar of one of the temples at Maeva was planted upon the body of a human victim."[4]

A ſeventeenth-century account of Japan mentions the belief there that a wall laid on the body

[1] "Notes and Queries," 5th ſer., vii., p. 284.

[2] Taylor's "New Zealand," p. 502. Cf. Bancroft's "Native Races," i., 161, note 25.

[3] Tylor's "Primitive Culture," i., p. 96. [4] *Ibid.*

of a willing human victim would be ſecure from accident; accordingly, when a great wall was to be built, ſome wretched ſlave would offer himſelf as foundation, lying down in the trench to be cruſhed by the heavy ſtones lowered upon him. When the gate of the new city of Tavoy, in Tenaſſerim, was built, perhaps twenty years ago, Maſon was told by an eye-witneſs that a criminal was put in each poſt-hole to become a protecting demon.[1]

Formerly in Siam, when a new city gate was being erected, it was cuſtomary for a number of officers to lie in wait and ſeize the firſt four or eight perſons who happened to paſs by, and who were then buried alive under the gate poſts to ſerve as guardian angels.[2]

Under the ſame group muſt be claſſified ſuch ſtories as that of the human victims buried for ſpirit-watchers under the gates of Mandalay, of the queen who was drowned in a Burmeſe reſervoir to make the dyke ſafe, of the hero whoſe divided body was buried under the fortreſs of Thatung to make it impregnable.[3]

In India, where cuſtom has cryſtallized more than in any other land, we learn that when Rajah Sala Byne was building the fort of Sialkot, in the Punjaub, the foundations of the ſouth-eaſt baſtion gave way ſo repeatedly that he had recourſe to a ſoothſayer, who aſſured him that it would never ſtand until the blood of an only ſon was ſhed there, wherefore the only ſon of a widow was ſacrificed;[4]

[1] Tylor's "Primitive Culture," i., p. 97.
[2] Alabaſter's "Wheel of the Law," p. 212.
[3] Tylor's "Primitive Culture," i., p. 97. [4] *Ibid.*

and "The Times," in its Indian correſpondence, dated from Calcutta, 1ſt Auguſt, 1880, has the following paſſage:—"A rumour has got abroad, and is firmly believed in by the lower claſſes of the natives, that the Government is about to ſacrifice a number of human beings in order to enforce the ſafety of the new harbour works, and has ordered the police to ſeize victims in the ſtreets. So thoroughly is the idea implanted, that people are afraid to venture out after nightfall. There was a ſimilar ſcare in Calcutta ſome ſeven or eight years ago, when the Hooghly bridge was being conſtructed. The natives then got hold of the idea that Mother Ganges, indignant at being bridged, had at laſt conſented to ſubmit to the inſult on the condition that each pier of the ſtructure was founded on a layer of children's heads." [1]

The cuſtom of the Fijians, though varying in detail, ſeems to belong to the ſame diviſion of our ſubject. The ſpot on which a chief has been killed is ſometimes, we are told by Williams, ſelected as the ſite of the *bure*, or temple. On ſetting up the pillars of a temple, and again, when the building is complete, men are killed and eaten.[2]

In theſe examples we come to the gate of the city, the temple, and the fort, all of them ſhowing a development from the moſt primitive forms of village life. No longer the foundation of the

[1] Mr. Carnac-Temple ſays that the belief in the foundation ſacrifice is current *throughout* India. See "Folk Lore Record," iv., p. 186.

[2] Williams's "Fiji," i., pp. 221-2. Cf. Pritchard's "Polyneſian Res.," p. 372.

ſimple houſe, or even the chief's houſe, the ſacrifice is transferred to much more important buildings as we come upon more civilized types of humanity. And ſo it is in European folk-lore. The church, the bridge, the caſtle, the wall of the city, the fortreſs, are the objects of this foundation ſacrifice in the legends of Germany, Thuringia, Denmark, Italy, Servia, and other parts of Europe. But it would be tedious to narrate theſe, as they are ſet out in detail in Mr. Tylor's "Primitive Culture," and they do not advance the ſubject now ſpecially in hand. European folk-lore is only parallel to Engliſh folk-lore as a common inheritance from Aryan anceſtors; but taking up the parallel between ſavage cuſtom and European folk-lore, we arrive at an earlier ſtage ſtill in the common inheritance of mankind.

What, then, does Engliſh tradition and folk-lore tell us of the foundation ſacrifice? I think we ſhall be able to identify the cuſtom by tracing out the various forms which legends of its occurrence have gradually aſſumed. In Scotland, ſays Mr. Tylor, there is current the belief that the Picts, to whom local legend attributes buildings of prehiſtoric antiquity, bathed their foundation ſtones with human blood. Surely this is the folk-lore legend of a foundation-ſacrifice for the village homeſtead. It ſeems to be the only pure tradition of the cuſtom in its earlieſt form, but there is ample evidence from other ſources, and this will be found to divide itſelf into hiſtorical legends, popular ſuperſtition, and variants of the legend in tranſitional and debaſed forms.

Let us ſtart with the moſt complete evidence, and ſee what new developments civilized life has forced folk-lore legends to aſſume. As might be expected, perhaps, the church is the nucleus round which the legends of foundation ſacrifice have moſt perſiſtently clung. The church was magnified into great importance among the early Chriſtians, and being, perhaps, the only large building in the diſtrict, the application of the legend, if not the actual obſervance of the rite, was naturally connected with it. Moreover, the church nearly always ſtood upon the ſite of the pagan temple, and Chriſtian prieſts often had to compromiſe between Chriſtian doctrine and pagan cuſtoms, to obtain a hearing for their new and civilizing creeds.

The ſacrifice of human victims as a foundation ſacrifice is related in our earlieſt chronicles, at a period of hiſtory, that is, when the ſtate of ſociety to which the cuſtom really belongs might naturally be called ſavage with regard to England as well as to modern barbariſm. The firſt inſtance, too, is connected not with the church, but with a tower. Nennius, in his "Hiſtoria Britonum," written about the eighth century, is the firſt to notice the tradition of the celebrated Merlin; but the beſt verſion of the ſtory is given by Geoffrey of Monmouth. Though Geoffrey's narrative is altogether rejected as hiſtory, there is no reaſon to reject it as a good collection of the traditions or popular beliefs of his time. His work was far too popular and too much ſought after to have been a tiſſue of romantic inventions from a fertile brain,

even if we can believe that the hiſtory of novel-writing begins ſo early as his era.[1] According to his account, Vortigern was adviſed by magicians to build a very ſtrong tower for his own ſafety, ſince he had loſt all his other fortified places. Accordingly he found a ſuitable place at Mount Erir, where he aſſembled workmen from ſeveral countries and ordered them to build the tower. The builders, therefore, began to lay the foundation; but whatever they did one day the earth ſwallowed up the next. Let me note here, in paſſing, that this feature of the ſtory is all-important for our future conſideration; it will re-appear, preſently, among popular legends of modern times. Vortigern being informed of the non-ſucceſs of his operations, again conſulted his magicians, who told him that he muſt find out a youth that never had a father and kill him, and then ſprinkle the ſtones and cement with his blood; for by this means only, they ſaid, would he have a firm foundation.[2] Mer-

[1] See Gairdner's "Early Chroniclers of England," p. 158; Stephens's "Literature of the Kymry," pp. 296-310. There are more MSS. of Geoffrey's work than of any other chronicle. Sir T. Duffus Hardy, in his collections of materials for Britiſh hiſtory, enumerates 192 copies, but I have identified from the Hiſtorical MSS. Commiſſion fourteen more copies, which Sir Thomas Hardy does not enumerate.

[2] See Geoffrey of Monmouth's "Britiſh Hiſtory," cap. xvii., book vi. Nennius "Hiſtoria Britonum" ſays that *the ground* on which the citadel was to be built was to be ſprinkled with blood; but the Iriſh verſion of Nennius, publiſhed by the Iriſh Archæological Society (pp. 93-97), ſays, "let his blood be ſprinkled upon the dun, for by this means only can it be built." Cap. 40. Matthew Paris alſo quotes from Geoffrey, *ſub anno*

lin, as we all know, was brought to the king for the victim, but he eſcaped his doom by telling Vortigern of other cauſes why the buildings diſappeared. But this ſtory is not ſo good as that of St. Columba. Merlin eſcapes the ſacrifice, but St. Columba actually carries out the rite in building on Iona. The legend is that when Columba firſt attempted to build on Iona, the walls, by the operation of ſome evil ſpirit, fell down as faſt as they were erected. Columba received ſupernatural information that they would never ſtand unleſs a human victim was buried alive. According to one account the lot fell on Oran, the companion of the Saint, as the victim that was demanded for the ſucceſs of the undertaking. Others pretend that Oran voluntarily devoted himſelf and was interred accordingly. At the end of three days Columba had the curioſity to take a farewell look at his old friend and ordered the earth to be removed. Oran raiſed his ſwimming eyes and ſaid, "There is no wonder in death, and hell is not as it is reported." The ſaint was ſo ſhocked at this impiety that he inſtantly ordered the earth to be flung in again, uttering the words, "Uir! Uir! air beal Orain ma'n labhair e tuile comh'radh"—that is, "Earth! Earth! on the mouth of Oran that he may blab no more." This paſſed into a proverb, and is in uſe in the Highlands at the preſent day.[1]

p. 464. See alſo "The Romance of Merlin," edited by H. B. Wheatley, F.S.A., for the Early Engliſh Text Society, p. 29.

[1] "New Statiſtical Account of Scotland," vii., p. 321; Pennant's "Second Tour in Scotland" (Pinkerton), iii., p. 298.

Taking us wholly out of the category of civilized cuſtom, theſe early chronicle legends are comparable with modern ſavage cuſtoms. We paſs by the parallel cuſtoms or traditions of modern Europe, becauſe theſe take us into Aryan life only; but modern ſavage cuſtom does much more than this —it declares Engliſh folk-lore, in this particular group at all events, and inferably ſo in other groups, to be the ſurvival of a ſavage ſtate of thought and exiſtence, which has come down from the earlieſt times in ſpite of the progreſs which human thought and civilization have made beyond barbariſm. But what if theſe legends of chronicle times can be followed up by relics of actual cuſtom? As they at preſent ſtand they may be the records of early legendary events which only actually occurred in Celtic Britain. Whether, however, theſe are traditions which have lived through Roman and Saxon times from the earlieſt Celtic inhabitants of Britain cannot now be proved; but, noting that the ſuppoſed ſources of the above legends are all Celtic, a remarkable diſcovery which I ſhall now relate tends to ſhow that there is no occaſion to ſtumble over the block which Celtic legendary hiſtory puts in our path.

In the year 1876, the old church at Brownſover, Warwickſhire, was reſtored, the earlier parts of the building were of Norman, the latter of early 13th century architecture. The church ſtands upon the ſite of an early Britiſh entrenchment about two miles from Rugby, and two from the Roman ſtation on the Watling Street road. It was found neceſſary

to lower the foundations of the north and ſouth walls of the church; and in doing ſo two ſkeletons were diſcovered, one under the north, the other under the ſouth wall—about one foot below the *original* foundations—exactly oppoſite to each other and about ſix feet from the chancel wall which croſſes the north and ſouth wall of the church at right angles. Each ſkeleton was covered with an oak ſlab about ſix feet in length by ten inches wide and two inches thick—of the colour of bog oak: theſe pieces of oak plank had evidently been uſed as carpenter's benches, from the fact that each of them had four mortice-holes cut in them in ſuch a form as to throw the legs outwards, and from the cuts made in them by edged tools. The ſkeletons were found in a ſpace cut out of the ſolid clay which had not been moved, on either ſide, and juſt large enough to take the bodies placed in them. The ſkeletons were ſeen *in ſitu;* they *could not have been placed there after the original walls had been built.* The ſkulls were, by an eminent authority, ſaid to be Daniſh. They were remarkably thick and heavy, as alſo were the jawbones. The teeth, though a good deal worn, were perfect in condition and number. The feet pointed towards the eaſt.[1] I am aware that the uſual explanation of ſuch circumſtances as theſe is that churches are invariably built on old burial-grounds, and hence the finding of the remains, but would this explanation ſatisfy all the above facts? Certainly it could not anſwer for the coffin of a prieſt being built *into the wall* at

[1] "The Antiquary," iii., p. 93.

Snailwell church, Cambridgeſhire,[1] and I am inclined to let theſetwo examples ſtand as archæological evidence of the cuſtom we are now working out from tradition.

Folk-lore is, however, a more thorough guide than archæology in theſe matters. Leaving theſe diſcoveries of human remains as the initial ſtage out of the Celtic period of the hiſtory of Britain, let us turn to ſome popular ſuperſtitions. In Lancaſhire, to build, or even to rebuild, a houſe is always fatal to ſome member of the family, generally to the one who may chiefly have adviſed or wiſhed for the building or alteration.[2]

Mr. Baring Gould points out the following Yorkſhire ſuperſtition:—"It is ſaid in that county that the firſt child baptiſed in a new font is ſure to die—a reminiſcence of the ſacrifice which was uſed for the conſecration of every dwelling and temple in heathen times, and of the pig or ſheep killed and laid at the foundation of churches. When I was incumbent of Dalton a new church was built. A blackſmith in the village had ſeven daughters, after which a ſon was born, and he came to me a few days before the conſecration of the new church to aſk me to baptiſe his boy in the old temporary church and font. 'Why, Joſeph,' ſaid I, 'if you will only wait till Thurſday the boy can be baptiſed in the new font on the opening of the new church.'

[1] "The Antiquary," iv., p. 279. Cf. the curious tradition of Lincoln's Inn, *ibid.*, p. 273; alſo the Leigh tradition, "Nature," 15th June, 1871.

[2] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the N. Counties," p. 45.

'Thank you, Sir,' said the blackſmith, with a wriggle, 'but you ſee it's a lad, and we ſhu'd be ſorry if he were to dee; na if t'had been a laſs inſtead, why then you were welcome, for 'twouldn't ha' mattered a ha'penny. Laſſes are ower mony and lads ower few wi' us.'"[1]

In Suſſex, too, we have ſomething of the kind in the cuſtom of burying a bottle full of pins under the hearthſtone at the building of a houſe, to preſerve it from witchcraft.[2]

A remarkable ſtory is given by Mr. Henderſon, which is unqueſtionably a debaſed form of the legend of foundation ſacrifice, and I muſt be pardoned for quoting it at ſome length, ſo exactly does it fit in its place here. Its modern framework will be at once detected, but ſo, I think, will its archaic germ. It is told to account for the peculiar ſhape of the dining-room in a certain Dartmoor vicarage:—

A clergyman, on taking poſſeſſion of a living on the confines of Dartmoor, found it neceſſary to enlarge the houſe. He lengthened the one ſitting-room, and made it into a tolerable dining-room, adding a drawing-room and two or three bedrooms. Theſe improvements ſatisfied his wife and children; but there was one intereſted party whom he had left out of conſideration—the ſpirit of his predeceſſor, an old gentleman who had outlived all his family, and paſſed many ſolitary years in the remote parſonage. And ere long the conſequences of this neglect appeared. Sounds were ſoon heard of an

[1] See Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of N. Counties," pp. 121, 274.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 232. Cf. "Archæologia," xlvi., p. 133, note.

evening as though a figure in a dreſſing-gown were ſweeping in and out of the rooms, and treading with a ſoft yet heavy tread, and this particularly in the dining-room, where the old vicar had ſpent the laſt years of his life. Uneaſineſs pervaded the houſehold. Servants gave warning and went away; no one applied for their vacant places. The daughters fell ill, and were ſent away for change of air; then their mother was anxious about them, and went to ſee how they were going on; and ſo the Vicar was left alone, at the mercy of his predeceſſor's ghoſt. At laſt, Mr. Henderſon relates, the Vicar himſelf was ſcared, and his churchwarden promiſed to lay the ghoſt. A jury of ſeven parſons was convoked, and each ſat for half-an-hour with a candle in his hand, and it burned out its time with ſix, ſhowing plainly that none of them could lay the ghoſt. Nor was this any wonder, for were they not all old acquaintances of his, ſo that he knew all their tricks? But the ſeventh parſon was a ſtranger, and a ſcholar freſh from Oxford. In his hand the light went out at once. He was clearly the man to lay the ghoſt, and he did not ſhrink from his taſk: he laid it at once, and in a beer-barrel. But now a freſh difficulty aroſe. What was to be done with the beer-barrel and its myſterious tenant? Nothing occurred to the aſſembled company but to roll the thing into one corner, and ſend for the maſon to incloſe it with ſtones and mortar. This done, the room looked very odd with one corner cut off. Uniformity would be attained if the other three were filled up as well; and beſides, the ghoſt would

be ſafer if no one knew the very ſpot in which he was repoſing. So the other corners were blocked up, and with ſucceſs.[1]

It will be ſeen that this ſtory, having in the ſhape of a modern ghoſt ſtory all the incidents of the foundation ſacrifice, practically takes us into the region of ſubſtitutes for human ſacrifices. Such is the permanence of tradition that this ghoſt ſtory, told to intereſt children or Chriſtmas parties, has in reality brought away with it from very early times the recollection of cuſtoms that civilization has wiped out. But we have other evidence beſide this ghoſt ſtory.

Mr. Tylor has pointed out that German folk-lore preſents us with the ſubſtitute of empty coffins being walled up with the ſtructure, and Daniſh folk-lore with a lamb walled in under the altar to make the church ſtand faſt.[2] In Scotland, however, I have come acroſs a ſtill more curious folk-lore ſubſtitute, and one that leads us nearer to the earlieſt forms of the cuſtom. The famous Ciſtercian Abbey, founded by Devorgilla, daughter of Allan, Lord of Galloway, and wife to John Balliol, and mother of John Balliol, King of Scotland, it appears was firſt called "The Abbey of Sweetheart," from the circumſtance of her huſband's heart being embalmed and encloſed in a box of ivory bound with ſilver and built into the walls of the church.[3] This is certainly a relic

[1] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," pp. 336-7.

[2] "Primitive Culture," i., p. 96.

[3] Sinclair's "Statiſtical Account of Scotland," ii., p. 138.

of the ſtill older cuſtom of ſacrificing human victims by building them into the wall, in order to ſecure the ſafety of the building.

This cuſtom of ſubſtitution carries us away ſtill further into the realms of modern legends or folk-tales. Remembering what has been ſaid above about the importance of the common feature of the Vortigern and the Columba ſtories, in which all that is built during the day is deſtroyed at night, let me now quote an Iriſh folk-tale which commences a ſeries of tranſitional forms of this tradition as recorded in our modern folk-lore.

"When St. Patrick was building the great church on the Rock of Caſhel the workmen uſed to be terribly annoyed, for whatever they put up by day was always found knocked down next morning. So one man watched and another man watched, but about one o'clock in the night every watcher fell aſleep as ſure as the hearth-money. At laſt St. Patrick himſelf ſat up, and, juſt as the clock ſtruck one, what did he ſee but a terrible bull, with fire flaſhing from his noſtrils, charging full drive up the hill, and pucking down every ſtone, ſtick, and bit of mortar that was put together the day before. 'Oh, ho!' ſays the ſaint, 'I'll ſoon find one that will ſettle you, my brave bull!' Now who was this but Uſheen (Oiſin), that St. Patrick was ſtriving to make a good Chriſtian. . . . The day after St. Patrick ſaw the bull, he up and told Uſheen all about what was going on. 'Put me on a rock or in a tree,' ſays Uſheen, 'juſt by the way the bull ran, and we'll ſee what we can do.' So in the evening he was ſettled comfortably in the bough of

a tree on the hillſide, and when the bull was firing away up the ſteep like a thunderbolt, and was nearly under him, he dropped down on his back, took a horn in each hand, tore him aſunder, and daſhed one of the ſides ſo hard againſt the face of the wall that it may be ſeen there this day, hardened into ſtone. There was no further ſtoppage of the work, and in gratitude they cut out the effigy of Uſheen riding on his pony, and it may be ſeen inſide the old ruins this very day."[1] This folk-ſtory appears to me to bridge over the chaſm between the traditional form and the earlieſt recorded literary form of the group of popular traditions with which we are now dealing. We have here the ſacrifice of the bull, without which the building would not have been completed, and his blood being ſcattered over the walls. But the main feature of this ſtory ſeems to reſt not ſo much upon the foundation ſacrifice, as upon the incident connected with it, namely, the deſtruction by night of what was built during the day. This is the particular feature of the ſtory that connects it with the ſtories of Vortigern and Columba; and the ſacrifice of the bull, though appearing only in the background, identifies the legend with the foundation ſacrifice.

But even a ſtill better variant of the legend is related in "The Antiquary" (iv., 279), by Mr. J. H. Round.

"In the pariſh of Tolleſhunt Knights, on the edge of the Eſſex marſhes, there is ſtill ſhown in the middle of a field an encloſed uncultivated ſpace. On the ſlope of a hill at ſome little diſtance there

[1] Kennedy's "Firefide Stories of Ireland," p. 153.

ſtands an ancient manor-houſe, commonly known as Barn Hall. The legend relates that it was originally attempted to erect this hall on the above encloſed ſpot, but that the devil came by night and deſtroyed the work of the day. A knight, attended by two dogs, was ſet to watch for the intruder; a tuſſle enſued, and the Prince of Darkneſs, ſnatching up a beam from the building, hurled it to the ſite of the preſent hall, exclaiming as he did ſo—

'Whereſoe'er this beam ſhall fall
There ſhall ſtand Barn Hall.'

The original beam was believed to remain in a cellar of the preſent houſe, and no one, it was ſaid, could cut it without wounding themſelves. But the point of the tale is yet to be told. The devil, enraged at the knight's interference, vowed that he would have him at his death, whether he were buried in the church or out of it. Now this doom was ingeniouſly averted *by burying him in the wall, half in, and half out, of the church.*"

In this unique form of the legend we find a ſtriking confirmation of the ſolution I have ſuggeſted. We have the nightly deſtruction, and we have the mural burial, which, as will preſently be ſhown, is a form of the foundation ſacrifice.

Keeping these variants of the ſtory in mind, therefore, it would appear that it has laſted in Engliſh tradition down to quite modern times. Still approaching the ſubject along the lines of a poſſible tranſition in the forms of the legend, we can diſcover one feature after another dwindling

away from the incidents of the ſtory, until we come upon a very meagre form of it indeed. The firſt group cuts out the incident of animal or human ſacrifice, but retains the animal cauſe of the removal of the building material during the night. It is a group of church building legends which are very common in all parts of the country, and muſt have deſcended from a common origin.

The church of Breedon, in Leiceſterſhire, ſtands alone on a high hill, the village being at its foot. The inhabitants relate that the founder aſſigned a central ſpot for the ſite of the church, but when the builders began to erect the fabric there, all they built in the courſe of the day was carried away by "doves" in the night, and ſkilfully built in the ſame manner on the hill where the church now ſtands.[1] And ſo for the pariſh church of Winwick, Lancaſhire, the founder had deſtined a different ſite for it; but after progreſs had been made at the original foundation, at night time a "pig" was ſeen running haſtily to the ſite of the new church, crying or ſcreaming aloud, "We-ee-wick, we-ee-wick, we-ee-wick." Then taking up a ſtone in his mouth he carried it to the ſpot ſanctified by the death of St. Oſwald, and thus ſucceeded in removing all the ſtones which had been laid by the builders.[2] The legend of "Burnley Croſs and the Demon Pigs" is of a ſimilar character. Prior to the foundation of any church in Burnley, religious rites were celebrated on the ſpot where the ancient croſs now ſtands. Upon the attempt being made to erect an

[1] Choice Notes, "Folk-Lore," p. 2. [2] *Ibid.*

oratory, the materials were nightly removed by ſupernatural agents in the ſhape of pigs to where St. Peter's church now ſtands.[1] At Leyland ſimilar incidents are related with a "cat" as the agency, and elſewhere a "fiſh" takes the place.[2]

This form of the legend is very inſtructive as a tranſitional form in the long proceſs of decay from the original primitive cuſtom. We have in place of the bull, "a pig," "a cat," "doves," and a "fiſh." And what is more important as a connecting link with the foundation ſacrifice, there is in the Lancaſhire ſtory, the diſtinct reminiſcence of the death of St. Oſwald having ſanctified the foundation.

Still keeping to that feature of the ſtories which has retained the firmeſt hold of the popular mind, we now come upon a group of legends which ſimply ſpeak of general cauſes or witches and fairies being the agency of the removal from one place to another.

In Roby's "Traditions of Lancaſhire" (vol. i. p. 27, firſt ſeries), there is a tale entitled "The Goblin Builders," ſhowing how "Gamel the Saxon thane, lord of Recedham or Rached (now Rochdale), intended to build a chapel unto St. Chadde, nigh to the banks of the Rache or Roach." A level convenient ſpot was choſen for the ſite, but thrice were the foundations there laid, and thrice were all the building materials conveyed by inviſible agency from this flat ſpot to a more airy and elevated ſituation. At laſt the thane, ceaſing to

[1] Harland and Wilkinſon's "Legends and Traditions of Lancaſhire," p. 8.

[2] See a note in Choice Notes, "Folk-Lore," p. 4.

ſtrive againſt fate, gave up his original deſign, and the preſent church was built upon the locality deſignated by theſe unſeen workmen.[1] The pariſh church of Wendover ſtands half-a-mile from the town. It was to have been built upon a field adjoining the town, and there the building of it was begun, but the materials were all carried away by witches, or, as ſome relate, by fairies, and depoſited where the church now ſtands. The field in which the church was to have been built is ſtill called "Witches' Meadow."[2] At Alfriſton, the foundations of the church were originally laid in a field on the weſt ſide of the town, and known as the Savyne Croft, but every night the ſtones that had been laid during the previous day were hurled by ſupernatural agency over the houſes into a field called "The Tye," where the church now ſtands. It is added that a certain wiſe man obſerved in this field four oxen lying aſleep, rump to rump, in the form of a croſs, and that that incident ſuggeſted the cruciform arrangement which was ultimately carried out in the building.[3] At Waldron, the materials for a church, which had been depoſited in a field on Horeham farm, were removed by a like myſterious agency to the preſent ſite of Waldron church. The ſpot near Horeham is ſtill known as "Church Field."[4] At Udimore, near Rye, the villagers, according to ancient tradition, began to build themſelves a

[1] See alſo Harland and Wilkinſon's "Legends and Traditions of Lancaſhire," p. 52.

[2] Choice Notes, "Folk-Lore," p. 4.

[3] "Suſſex Archæological Collections," xiii., p. 226. [4] *Ibid.*

church, on the oppoſite ſide of the little river Ree to that where it was eventually reared. Night after night, however, witneſſed the diſlocation of huge ſtones from the walls built during the preceding day. Unſeen hands hurled the ſtones to the oppoſite ſide of the river, and an awful ſupernatural voice in the air uttered, in warning and reproachful tones, "O'er the mere! o'er the mere!"[1] At Inveraven, in Banffshire, there is a tradition that the rebuilding of the old caſtle of Ballindalloch near a ſmall ſtream was prevented by unſeen agency—the part built in the daytime being always thrown down through the night. At length a voice was heard, ſaying, "Build in the cow haugh, and you ſhall meet with no interruption." This was done, and the houſe conſequently raiſed and remained.[2]

There are ſtill more debaſed forms of the old building legends, and one example of theſe I muſt give. The church of Over in Cheſhire ſtands about a mile from the more populous part of the village. Tradition aſcribes its preſent poſition to his Satanic majeſty. Alarmed at the pious zeal of villagers in attending their church ſo well, and fearful of loſing his worſhippers by its convenience, he ſought to avert ſuch loſs to himſelf by robbing them of the building and carrying it away bodily; but the prayers of the monks prevailed againſt him ſo far that he was glad to drop his burden as quickly as poſſible, when it fell where it now ſtands.

The legend of the church is intereſting as a rem-

[1] "Suſſex Archæological Collections," xiii., p. 227.

[2] "New Statiſtical Account of Scotland," xiii., p. 134.

nant of the paſt, and a poetical verſion of it has been given by Major Egerton Leigh in his "Ballads and Legends of Cheſhire" (p. 191), from which I quote a verſe or two :—

"Over Church in days of yore,
So ſpeaks traditionary lore,
Amidward Over ſtood.

"In vain the Devil ſpread his net,
The church, protecting, ever let
His ſchemes againſt men's ſouls.

"At length he ruſh'd the church to ſeize
Nor leſs his deviliſh ſpite might pleaſe,
And bear it far away.

"With claws the fane from earth he tore,
And on his impious wings upbore
One morn at break of day.

"He dreamt not he was heard and ſpied
By monks he had ſo oft defied,
Since firſt from Heaven he fell.

"At once in holy chorus ſwell,
Their earneſt prayers (of ſin the knell),
To ſtay the robber's flight.

"Still undiſmay'd he onward flew,
Though heavier ſtill his burden grew,
He held on like deſpair.

"What ſound is that now moves freſh fears?
The Devil trembles as he hears
Bells rolling through the air.

"Hark! from ſome diſtant tower unſeen,
(Vale Royal's Abbey church, I ween),
A craſhing peal rings forth.

"Well know we evil ſpirits fear
The ſound of bells ſo ſtrong, ſo clear,
Such holy notes they dread.

" As Satan ſtruggles on in pain,
His boaſted ſtrength begins to wane,
Though eke by malice fed.

" Stunned by monks' prayers and pealing noiſe,
In vain he ſtrives the weight to poiſe,
Swift from his graſp it fell.

" He ſpurned the church as down it flew,
But a dark miſt its mantle threw
For ſafety round the pile.

" Preſerved it ſtood—there ſtill it ſtands—
Reſcued from ſacrilegious hands,
Eſcaped the foul fiend's blow.

" One meaſured mile from the old ſite
Where firſt from air it did alight,
The church ſtill Satan ſcares.

" This is the reaſon why they ſay
That Over Church from Over town,
Stands diſtant many roods away."

To theſe legends, as debaſed forms of the foundation ſacrifice legends, may, I think, be added ſome of the ghoſt-laying ſtories. Already, in the ſtory quoted from Mr. Henderſon, we have the ſubject brought before us by a very direct analogy, and although in other ſtories we cannot revert back to the incident of building being the cauſe of the ſubſequent ſacrifice, yet this is an incident that might well have dropped out in the courſe of tranſmiſſion. Thus the legend connected with Clegg Hall, Lancaſhire, records that a pious monk wiſhing to " lay " the two ghoſts who haunted the place came to a parley with them, and that they then demanded, as a condition of future quiet, the ſacrifice of a body and a ſoul. The cunning monk ſubſtitutes the body of a cock

and the ſole of a ſhoe.[1] This ſubſtitution of the cock for the human ſacrifice is curiouſly like the ſubſtitution among the Dayaks and in France when foundation ſacrifice is the object in view. And we have theſe kind of ſtories elſewhere. The ſacrificial element in them is plain enough, and if in the nurſery they are told as mere ghoſt ſtories, they muſt in the ſtudy, it appears to me, reflect the old tradition that the ſpirit of the place requires a ſacrifice before the building can be inhabited.

Theſe are typical examples of a claſs of traditions which are common enough in England and Scotland.[2] Taken ſingly, they might perhaps be regarded as an adaptation of legendary events to unexplained or unrelated hiſtorical facts—as the ideal fancies of villagers in explaining a curious phenomenon of their own villages, or as Mr. Lach-Szyrma has ſuggeſted ("Antiquary," iii., p. 188), they may be the popular perſonification of ſtorm-myths. This is no doubt the origin of one claſs of building legends, but for the claſs with which we are now ſpecially dealing, I think my grouping affords the correct explanation. Unrecorded as they have been up to the preſent time in literature, could the Suſſex peaſant relate the ſelf-ſame tradition as the Scotch Highlander, ſuppoſing both of them to have created the legend independently of each other? This queſtion—the parallel to which is aſked in many of the wider ſtages

[1] Harland and Wilkinſon's "Legends and Traditions of Lancaſhire," p. 12.

[2] See many curious examples collected in "The Antiquary," iii., pp. 188-189, and iv., pp. 33-34, 85, 133-4.

of folk-lore—is anſwered, and ſucceſsfully anſwered, by the theory of a common origin of the earlieſt forms of this tradition. That form had connected with it an incident of ſavage cuſtom which has gradually died out in the proceſs of its traditional life in modern days. How gradual was the decay is, I think, ſhown by the diſtinct tranſitional groups into which this claſs of ſtories is capable of being divided, each group keeping faſt hold of an important and dramatic feature which appears in the earlieſt group of all. Moreover, in evidence of the fact that this feature, which has filtered through all obſtacles into modern literature, is a primitive feature of the ſtory, we find that in addition to the Suſſex peaſant and the Scotch Highlander having preſerved the ſelf-ſame form of it, the New Zealander has alſo to be included in the caſe. One cannot poſitively ſay whether the New Zealand tradition is due to Chriſtian miſſionary teachings or to a development of culture in this particular reſpect among the New Zealanders. But in the tradition about ſome remarkable-looking rocks at Whangarei, we have a diſtinct parallel with the lateſt forms of Engliſh folk-lore traditions of inviſible agency interfering with the work of building. We do not even get the incident of ſacrifice of animal life—nothing but the bare legend as it is told in Engliſh villages, with but little meaning until we come to group the various verſions together. The tradition may be ſummarized as follows: Formerly a very powerful prieſt, Manaia, lived at Whangarei; his wife, Maunga-kie-kie, was alſo a prieſteſs. The

tradition ſtates that the rocks were made by Manaia's daughter for the convenience of fiſhing, but her father's gods every night replaced all the ſtones ſhe had brought during the day and returned them to their original poſition. This oppoſition being continued night after night, ſhe at laſt gave it up as being quite hopeleſs. The entire family then determined on going from Whangarei to the Bay of Iſlands, but having quarrelled among themſelves, the gods, who were looking on, turned the whole party into ſtone.[1]

If this laſt important addition to our evidence is not due to the influence of civilized teaching, the whole group of building traditions affords very curious inſtances of the parallels between Engliſh folk-lore and ſavage cuſtom. Not only is the moſt archaic Engliſh form of a cuſtom parallel to the exiſting cuſtoms of ſavages, but when ſavages have broken away from their early cuſtoms and retained, either by tradition or ſymboliſm, remnants of their ſavage rites, theſe new forms in ſavage life parallel the folk-lore forms of Engliſh life.

I cannot paſs away from theſe legends without mentioning the fine example we get from Roumania. It is particularly intereſting to us in connection with the preſent ſubject, becauſe it is an illuſtration of the way in which, when Engliſh traditions have not retained their earlieſt forms, European parallel traditions may be the link between the civilized tradition and the ſavage cuſtom. This Roumanian ſtory

[1] Taylor's "New Zealand," pp. 276-7.

has all the features of the primitive ſavage cuſtom and of the later traditional forms. There is the human ſacrifice, that is to ſay, and the demolition of the building by unſeen agency. Moreover, this ſtory is ſo beautiful in its narrative, that my readers will not object to having it transferred to theſe pages from the collection of "Roumanian Fairy Tales and Legends," publiſhed anonymouſly by Miſs E. B. Mawer, of Buchareſt.

The ſtory relates how Radu the Black, Prince of the Country, and founder of the principality, wanted to build a monaſtery, and ſetting out with a numerous cavalcade in ſearch of a ſuitable ſite, he comes upon a young ſhepherd playing on his flute a doïna (national wail) of his country.

"Shepherd," cried Radu, ſtopping him, "thou muſt often with thy flocks have explored the banks of the Argis; tell me haſt thou never ſeen a wall hidden amongſt the green bruſhwood of the nut trees?"

"Yes, Prince, I have ſeen a wall which was begun to be built, and my dogs howled at it, as if they had been howling for a death."

"Right," ſaid the Prince, with ſatisfaction, "it is there that our monaſtery ſhall riſe;" then calling Manoli and his maſons, "Liſten," he ſaid, "I wiſh you to build me an edifice, ſo noble and beautiful, that its equal ſhall never be found, neither in the preſent nor in the future. I promiſe to you all treaſures, titles, and eſtates, which ſhall make you equal with the Boyards of my court. I promiſe on the honour of a prince, and you know you may

rely on my promiſes. Wait! don't thank me yet! My word is ſacred, and again I ſay, what I promiſe I always carry out; if you do not ſucceed, I will have you walled up living in the foundation of the monaſtery, which ſhall be built by cleverer hands than yours."

The maſons get quickly to work; they meaſure the ground, they dig the ſoil, and ſoon a majeſtic wall begins to riſe. Satisfied with their work, and certain of ſucceſs, they fall aſleep, and dream of the lands, and treaſures, and titles which their ſkilfulneſs is to bring them. Morning comes, the golden rays of the ſun dart over the waters of the Argis; the cool morning air, and the deſire to continue their work—only interrupted for needful repoſe—arouſe the maſons; they ſeize their tools and walk quickly to re-commence their labours; but alas! during the night all had crumbled and diſappeared.

Inſtead of ſitting down and complaining, the maſons re-commenced their taſk, and at the end of the day they have repaired the terrible diſaſter, and when evening comes they again ſeek repoſe.

Again morning, and again ſunlight reveals the crumbled walls! This happens four times to them.

The fourth night, notwithſtanding his anxiety, Manoli ſleeps, and he dreams a ſtrange and terrible dream. He awakes and calls his comrades. "Liſten," he ſays, "to what has been told me while I was aſleep. A voice whiſpered to me that all our work will be in vain; that each night the work of each day will be deſtroyed unleſs we wall up, living,

in our edifice, the firſt woman, be ſhe wife or ſiſter, who in the early morning comes to bring our food."

The proſpects of the honours which the conſtruction of the monaſtery was to bring them; the riches and titles with which their work was to be recompenſed, decided the workmen, and they each ſwore a ſolemn oath, to wall up while living, be ſhe ſiſter or wife, the firſt woman who ſhould come amongſt them next day.

Morning arrived clear and pure, as if it would not light on one deſpairing heart. Manoli anxiouſly looks into the diſtance, his oath ſtrikes him with terror, and gets on a hillock to look around him; he even mounts a ſcaffolding, and his eyes ſcan fearfully the ſurrounding plain.

Diſtant, far diſtant, he ſees ſomething advancing. Who comes in ſuch haſte? In truth it is a woman, careful and diligent, bringing the early morning meal to the man ſhe loves. See! with quick, light ſtep ſhe comes nearer and nearer,—ſhe is recognized. It is the beautiful Flora, the wife of Manoli!

Everything diſappears from Manoli's ſight, the ſun is dark and ſwollen; inſtead of light there is the darkneſs of the tomb.

He falls on his knees, and joining his hands, calls, "Oh Lord God! open the cataracts of Heaven, ſhower on the earth torrents of water, turn the ſtreamlets into lakes, oh merciful Saviour, that my wife may not be able to reach me here!" Did God liſten to his prayer? Shortly clouds cover the ſky, and heavy rain began to fall, but Flora

continued her way. Was not her huſband waiting? What mattered theſe obſtacles?

Againſt ſtream and torrent ſhe ſtill advances, and Manoli watching her, again kneels, joins his hands, and cries, "Oh my God, ſend a wind to twiſt and tear up the plantains, to overthrow the mountains, and to force my wife to return to the valley!"

The wind riſes and whiſtles in the foreſt, uproots the plantains, overthrows mountains, yet Flora only haſtens more quickly to reach her huſband, and at length arrives at the fatal ſpot. Then the maſons tremble at the ſight, but tremble with joy.

While Manoli, grief-ſtricken, takes his wife in his arms and ſays, "Liſten, my dear. To amuſe ourſelves, we are going to pretend to build you up in theſe walls; it will be I who will place you there, ſo be very quiet."

Flora laughingly conſented, for ſhe loved Manoli and had full confidence in him. Manoli ſighed heavily, but though ſighing, began to build the wall, which already reaches to the ankles of Flora—to her knees—higher and higher. Flora laughs no longer, but ſeized with terror, cries, "Manoli, Manoli! leave off this cruel joking! the wall preſſes on me, it will cruſh me!"

Manoli is ſilent, but works on: the wall ſtill riſes, and is now level with her waiſt.

Again ſhe cries, "Manoli! Manoli! ſtay your hand; ſoon I ſhall no longer ſee you; I love you ſo, and you are ſacrificing me, and yet you ſay you love me too."

Manoli works on, and to conſole himſelf, thinks, "Shortly I ſhall no longer hear her complaining; ſuffering is not ſo bad when one does not witneſs it."

The work proceeds—the wall riſes even to her eyebrows—at length ſhe is hid from ſight entirely. Manoli moves away, but ſtill hears the faint moaning voice of his wife: "Manoli, Manoli! the wall is preſſing on me and my life is dying out!"

* * * * * * *

The day was magnificent on which the Prince came to kneel and give thanks at the beautiful monaſtery, the beſt proportioned and the fineſt in ſtyle which had ever been built. The maſter maſons, Manoli amongſt them, ſwelling with pride, waited at the top of the ſcaffolding the viſit, the praiſe and the recompenſe of Radu, their Prince.

But the Prince commanded the people below to knock away props, poles, and planks, and the maſons fell from the great height to an inſtantaneous death. Manoli alone caught at a projecting carving, and paſſing from one to another, would ſoon have reached the ground, but there came from the wall which he was touching, the cry, "Manoli, Manoli! the cold wall is preſſing on me, my body is cruſhed, and my life is dying out." At this ſound, Manoli turns giddy and faint, and falls to the earth.

On the ſpot where he fell, there ſprings a fountain of clear, ſparkling water, but its taſte is ſalt and bitter as the tears which are ſhed in Roumania,

even now, when any one relates the ſorrows and the ſacrifice of Flora, the wife of Manoli.

This beautiful and touching legend may well end our chapter on the foundation ſacrifice. It has more poetry and muſic in it than its Engliſh parallels, and it is far more perfect in detail. It has retained the incident of ſavage life as an important part of its own dramatic form; and it thus ſtands midway between the Engliſh traditions and the ſavage cuſtom. What we have practically done, then, by theſe cloſe parallels between Engliſh folk-lore and ſavage cuſtom, is to demonſtrate to the ſcientific ſtudent of Engliſh hiſtory that ſome of the loſt chapters of its earlieſt ſtages are capable of being reſtored; and what we have done for the folk-loriſt is, I hope, to demonſtrate to him that the cuſtoms and traditions he loves for their beauty of conſtruction, their weirdneſs, or their local aſſociations, have taken him back to times when they all lived as parts, and important parts, of a village life which, preceding all hiſtorical records, ſcarcely treads upon the borders of civilization. In this branch of our ſubject we have been obliged to trace out the development of the traditional forms with ſome degree of preciſeneſs, becauſe otherwiſe they were not recognizable as parallels to a ſavage cuſtom. But this work muſt not let us loſe ſight of the ſignificance of the cuſtom itſelf as bearing upon primitive village life. It is not too much to ſay that the foundation ſacrifice—horrible in its moſt ſavage form, brutal in its later

forms—had very much to do with the preſervation of early ſociety. So low down in the ſcale of man's hiſtory there is very little law, very little reſtraint upon the paſſions and temper of brute force. But once place as a barrier to lawleſſneſs and licence the ſanctification by blood ſacrifice, ſometimes as we know human ſacrifice; and at all events within the home, perhaps within the precincts of the home, what law has not done, the fear of offending local ſpirits, who have accepted ſacrifice, will effectually do. We ſhall ſee preſently how the ideas connected with the foundation ſacrifice penetrated within the houſehold and kept ſacred many domeſtic rights which otherwiſe had no protection; and further, that the foundation ſacrifice commenced and helped forward the germs of law and morality, ſeems to me to be a concluſion we may well draw from the circumſtances of the caſe. Undefended by a ſtate police, as civilization is accuſtomed to, the primitive home was defended by the village gods. And theſe village gods, known to exiſt in the primitive homes of ſavage races, are now proved to have exiſted in the primitive homes of the anceſtors of civilized Britain, becauſe we can trace them there through exiſting legends and ſuperſtitions.

CHAPTER IV.

THE OCCUPATION OF THE HOMESTEAD.

THE foundation ſacrifice is not the only cuſtom of ſavage ſociety connected with buildings that will be found to have its parallel in civilized ſociety. As a propitiation to the ſpirit of the locality, the hiſtory of the foundation ſacrifice, as it has been recorded in the previous chapter, is ſo complete that its right to a firſt place in our archæological re-arrangement of Engliſh folk-lore is very clear. It alſo acts as a clue to the method of reſearch which muſt be adopted where the parallel between Engliſh and ſavage folk-lore is not quite complete. Accordingly, we now turn to a few other cuſtoms and obſervances relating to the building of a homeſtead, which, though not ſo typical as thoſe juſt conſidered, ſtill carry us very far into the realms of comparative folk-lore, and conſequently into the hiſtory of early village life in Britain. I ſhall, therefore, proceed to ſet forth ſome cuſtoms of primitive ſociety which relate, firſt, to the building of the houſe,

ſecondly, to the occupation thereof; and after we have thus gained ſome idea of how primitive man looked upon his homeſtead, ſome idea of the ever conſtant faiths and beliefs with which he ſurrounded his primitive village home, we ſhall be able, alſo, to underſtand that ſocial reſtraints, which are the effect of civilized law or civilized morality in modern ſociety, exiſted likewiſe in unwritten village cuſtoms in primitive ſociety; and we ſhall be able to conſtruct ſome portions of Engliſh hiſtory belonging to a period long anterior to written laws or written hiſtories.

From a moſt remarkable Tamil treatiſe which has been publiſhed in the "Indian Antiquary,"[1] the ceremony of building a houſe is aſcertained to be governed by the cloſeſt obſervance of very minute practices. The lucky day, and the lucky hour of the day muſt firſt be aſcertained. On your way to ſelect a ſite, ſhould a perſon with a broad head, or a bald head, ſhould a ſnake, a ſanyâſi, a ſingle Brâhman, a woman with no breaſts, a new pot, a perſon without a noſe, a bundle of firewood, a ſick perſon, a barber, a blind perſon, an oil merchant,—ſhould theſe or any of them meet you, it is an omen of evil. Should the architect or the maſter about to build a houſe, meet a young handſome virgin, the ſign is propitious. Then follows the ceremony of aſcertaining the auſpicious hour. And upon at laſt beginning actual operations, the very ſpade that is uſed to mark off the ſite of the propoſed building, and the peg and lines muſt give forth their omens.

[1] 'Silpa 'Sâſtra, "Indian Antiquary," v., pp. 230-7, 293-7.

If the edge of the ſpade bends at the firſt delve, if the peg flies out of the ground as the blow is made upon it, or if the marking line ſnaps in two, theſe are inauſpicious omens. Then auſpicious days are given for ſetting up the poſts, rafters, &c.; on Monday ſet up the poſts, on Wedneſday place the rafters, on Friday thatch the houſe, and on Thurſday take up reſidence. Strange as all this appears to Europeans, natives regard theſe things as matters of great importance, and many of the rules mentioned in this old treatiſe are adhered to now.

Theſe, and a great many more curious obſervances, not of immediate intereſt enough to tranſcribe here, are mentioned in this curious treatiſe. The Hindoos ſeem to have gathered together the ſuperſtitions of ages, and to have kept on adding to their beliefs until we arrive at a code that cannot be matched elſewhere. Still we do find glimpſes of the ſame ſtate of things in other parts of the world, and if I have brought forward the Tamil treatiſe as a ſpecies of pattern, there are relics elſewhere which ſhow a parallel ſtate of belief and ideas.

In Oriſſa upon building a houſe, you muſt be careful to begin with the ſouthern wall and build northwards, and it is very unlucky to add to a houſe on the ſouth ſide. If you are obliged to do ſo you muſt leave a cubit and a quarter of clear ſpace between the new houſe and the old.[1]

The Nicobar Iſlanders will not uſe nails in the conſtruction of their houſes. Before they build a

[1] "Indian Antiquary," i., p. 169.

houſe, the prieſt is called to chooſe the ſpot, and by different ceremonies he compels the Hivie or ſpirit to leave the place.[1]

Even when the houſe is built, the ſame conception of a connection of the ſpirit world with it is kept up. While idolatry exiſted in Hawaii, a number of ſuperſtitious ceremonies were performed in houſes before they could be occupied. Offerings were made to the gods, and preſents to the prieſts who entered the houſe, uttered prayers, went through other ceremonies, and ſlept in it before the owner took poſſeſſion, in order to prevent evil ſpirits from reſorting to it and to ſecure its inmates from the effects of incantations (Ellis, "Miſſionary Tour through Hawaii," p. 293). In Madagaſcar, the firſt corner poſt ſet up when building a houſe is always at the ſacred part of it. Several kinds of plants are attached to its baſe, and on the top is fixed a ſilver chain, a ſort of aſſurance that the owner will always have money in his dwelling. In the caſe of a royal houſe, the poſt is ſprinkled by the ſovereign with ſacred water brought from a ſpecial ſpring, and an invocation is announced imploring a bleſſing on the building.[2]

Among the Hill tribes of the Chittagong diſtrict, the principal poſt of the houſe is conſidered ſacred, and the head of the family is the only perſon who can touch it. Should any other perſon do the ſame he becomes the ſlave of the maſter of the houſe ("Journ. Aſiatic Soc. Bengal," xiv. 383). And

[1] "Journ. Aſiatic Society of Bengal," xv., p. 351.

[2] "Folk-Lore Record," ii., p. 38.

we meet with the ſame idea in an altogether different part of the world. In a ſtory called "The Wiſdom of Manihiki," in Gill's "Myths and Songs of the South Pacific," p. 63, it is related that a wonderful lad had noticed that his father myſteriouſly diſappeared at dawn every day, and in an equally myſterious way came back again to their dwelling at night. Being reſolved to diſcover the ſecret, the ſon puts his father's girdle under him at night (when he ſleeps with his father), and accordingly was rouſed from his ſlumbers by the girdle being pulled from under him: he lay perfectly ſtill to ſee what would become of his father. The unſuſpecting parent went, as he was wont, to the main pillar of his dwelling and ſaid:—

"O pillar! open, open up,
That Manuahifare may enter and deſcend to nether-world."

But the feeling of ſuperſtitious reverence or fear connected with the houſe is carried to a much greater extent among other races.

A New Zealander will never lean his back againſt the wall of a houſe. The company aſſembled within a houſe, however numerous, always leave a little ſpace between themſelves and the wall. The cauſe of this ſtrong objection to ſit cloſe to the wall, is their dread of the myſterious influence of certain *tapu* objects, which have been thruſt into the ruſh walls of dwelling houſes for concealment. (Shortland's "Traditions, &c., of the New Zealanders," p. 112.)

And ſo in various ideas as to the deſertion of a

houſe, or as to a death within it, we meet with the all-prevailing feelings.

It appears to have been a cuſtom with the ancient Americans, yet obſerved by the Indians of modern times, never to occupy the ſame wigwam a ſecond time. A ſuperſtition is univerſally prevalent among the north-weſtern Indians that live in tents, that when a place of abode has been deſerted, an evil ſpirit enters and dwells there.[1] Among the New Zealanders a deſerted houſe becomes of ſacred importance.[2]

In Aſam houſes are deſerted when deaths have occurred in them.[3] And ſo it is with the Ovahereró, a South African tribe.[4]

And it is curious to note that the Kaffirs have a great repugnance to a perſon's dying inſide the hut, and even reſpectable Kaffirs are generally carried outſide to expire.[5]

An almoſt correſponding belief is the notion of the Ahts of Vancouver Iſland, that when a perſon is dangerouſly ill his ſoul leaves his body and goes down to the country of Chay-her, but does not enter a houſe. If it enters a houſe, it is a ſign that it has taken up its abode below for good, and the ſick man dies.[6]

[1] "Traditions of Dee-Coo-Dah," by W. Pidgeon, p. 134.

[2] Polack's "Manners and Cuſtoms of the New Zealanders," i., p. 215-16.

[3] "Aſiatic Reſearches," xvii., p. 369.

[4] South African "Folk-Lore Journal," vol. i., p. 61.

[5] Maclean's "Kaffir Laws and Cuſtoms," p. 102.

[6] Sproat's "Scenes and Studies of Savage Life," p. 214.

In the interior of the iſland of Madagaſcar, particularly in Ankova, a feeling of veneration is aſſociated with the north ſide of the houſe as the part ſacred to their anceſtors. Should the ſpirits of the departed viſit their former abodes, the northern part of the houſe is the place in which they would be heard.[1]

Such are a few of the cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions which relate to the houſe in primitive ſociety. The great and ſpecial feature about them is the ſtrong animiſtic aſſociations with which the houſe is ſurrounded. The ſpirit-world has to be reckoned with at every ſtage. Now what is this houſe-ſpirit, if we may now call it ſo—is it a mere unmeaning ſuperſtition, or does it repreſent a primitive ſyſtem of belief? There ſeems to me but little doubt that we have here the firſt conceptions of the anceſtral ſpirit of the family, who guards and watches over and demands worſhip and ſacrifice from its children. Of courſe we ſhall have to proceed carefully along the lines of compariſon to diſcover the ſelf-ſame claſs of thought and ſuperſtitious belief in civilized ſociety, where civilized thought and action have been operating upon the beliefs of mankind for centuries, but, as we ſhall find out, without eradicating ſome of the earlieſt ideas which the human race in its infancy was capable of producing.

Mr. Gregor ſays: "On laying the foundation of a houſe in Scotland, there was the indiſpenſable

[1] Ellis's "Hiſtory of Madagaſcar," i., p. 240; 'Folk Lore Record,' ii., 37.

foonin pint. The workmen were regaled with whiſky or ale, with bread and cheeſe. Unleſs this was done, happineſs and health would not reſt on the houſe. It is told of a manſe on the banks of the Spey, that the miniſter refuſed to give the uſual *foonin pint*, and that, out of revenge, the maſons built into the wall a piece of a graveſtone. The conſequence was the houſe proved unhealthy, and the miniſters very ſhort-lived."[1]

On removing from one houſe to another it was accounted unlucky to get poſſeſſion of a clean houſe. "Dirt's luck," ſays the proverb. If one who was removing from a houſe was jealous of the ſucceſſor, and wiſhed to carry off the good fortune of the houſe, the out-going tenant ſwept it clean on leaving it. There were two other methods of taking away the luck from a houſe. The one was for the tenant who was leaving, to mount to the roof and pull up the *crook* through the *lum*, inſtead of removing it in the uſual way by the door. The other was by *trailing the raip*. A rope of ſtraw was twiſted from left to right—the *vrang wye*—and pulled round the houſe contrary to the courſe of the ſun. To avert all evil from thoſe who were entering a houſe others had quitted, if there was ſuſpicion that evil had been left on it, a cat was thrown into it before any of the new in-dwellers entered. If evil had been left on it, the cat in no long time ſickened and died.[2]

[1] Gregor's "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," pp. 50, 51.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

Now in theſe curious Scottiſh cuſtoms we have a clear indication of what has already been ſeen is the belief with ſavage life, namely, a ſpirit of the houſe which affects, or may affect, the occupier. The parallel between the American Indian ſuperſtition about not occupying a deſerted wigwam, and the Scotch cuſtoms upon entering a new houſe, are particularly cloſe. But we may go a ſtep further than this, I think. We ſhall, it is true, be obliged to go ſomewhat beyond the homeſtead, the private dwellings of the primitive village, and take our ſtand upon the place of aſſembly or the temple of the village. Still the transfer of ſuperſtition from a general object to a particular object is ſimply the anſwer to the ever-prominent queſtion, what are the effects of civilization and political progreſs upon primitive life?

We find then, that the ſelfsame feelings which prevented the New Zealander from leaning againſt the wall of a building, prevented ſome of the inhabitants of Great Britain from worſhipping otherwiſe than under the open ſky. A paſſage in Train's "Hiſtory of the Iſle of Man" well illuſtrates this. Churches were built, ſays this author, and age after age ſucceſſively paſſed away, yet ſo deeply rooted was the opinion in the minds of the people that ſupplications to the Deity could not be offered in any place ſo appropriate as from an eminence in the open air, that down to the cloſe of the eighteenth century, a numerous ſect prevailed in the ſouth of Scotland, called Mountaineers, or Hill Folks, from their convening on the hills to perform their devo-

tional exerciſes after the manner of their forefathers. The mounds adjoining the churches in the Iſle of Man were uſed for the ſame purpoſes.[1] But we can tranſlate this deeply-rooted popular opinion into ſtronger language ſtill—language that takes us from the borderland right into the depths of primitive thought and action—by turning from religious aſſemblies to political aſſemblies. The well-known ſtory from Beda details the particulars with curious exactitude. "The king, Ethelbert of Kent, came to the iſland of Thanet, and ſitting in the open air, ordered Auguſtine and his companions to be brought into his preſence. For he had taken the precaution that they ſhould not come to him in any houſe, leſt, according to an ancient ſuperſtition, if they practiſed any magical arts, they might impoſe upon him and ſo get the better of him." This is plain language enough. It is to be met with elſewhere, however. The Deemſters of the Iſle of Man in former times muſt judge in the open air, that magic might have leſs power over them, and the ſelfsame idea occurs in Ireland, where the Brehon judges ſat in the open air.[2] This little group of parallel Anglo-ſavage folk-lore takes us back to very early times indeed in the hiſtory of Engliſh inſtitutions, times when houſehold gods occupied the place of Chriſtianity, and ſuperſtitions and fears the place of morality and knowledge. I very much doubt if anything in

[1] Vol. i., p. 269.

[2] I have detailed theſe curious examples of primitive thought in my book "Primitive Folkmoots, or Open Air Aſſemblies in Britain," pp. 55, 94.

the whole range of ſurvival of primitive culture in civilized lands appeals more forcibly to hiſtorical proof than the open-air judging of the Deemſters of the Iſle of Man, which is thrown back for explanation upon the open-air meeting of Ethelbert of Kent, and thence to the practices of primitive ſociety. There we meet with ample proof that worſhip and legiſlation muſt not be attempted within roofed buildings; and although we cannot ſtep from the platform of public law to that of private cuſtom by means of hiſtorical aids when dealing with Great Britain only, yet it appears to me that the fears of Ethelbert of Kent were only parallel to the peculiar cuſtom of the Rajah of Kachar, who never reſided in a building of maſonry, but in bungalows ſurrounded by a ſtockaded encloſure,[1]—both the Saxon king and the Indian chief miſtruſting the building of civilized life and in the latter caſe carrying his miſtruſt far enough to retain the dwelling that he uſed to have among the woods of Upper Aſſam, where ſtone buildings were unknown.

The peculiar poſition which the houſe and its animiſtic ſurroundings occupied in the mind of the primitive villager, is further to be illuſtrated from ſome curious items of Engliſh folk-lore. An old cottage tenant at Poliphant, near Launceſton, when aſked why he allowed a hole in the wall of his houſe to remain unrepaired, anſwered that he would not have it ſtopped up on any account, as he left it on purpoſe for the piſkies (Corniſh for

[1] "Journal, Aſiatic Society, Bengal," ix., p. 832.

pixies) to come in and out as they had done for many years.[1]

We have ſeen how among ſome ſavage races the dying were taken out of the hut to breathe their laſt; and this meets with a ſimilar idea in the queſtion of Meg Merrilies, "Wha' ever heard of a door being barred when a man was in the dead-thraw? How d'ye think the ſpirit was to get awa thro' bolts and bars like thae'"—a queſtion which ſhe anſwers herſelf on the occaſion of the ſmuggler's death in the Kaim of Derncleugh, when, unbarring the door, ſhe ſays:—

> "Open lock, end ſtrife,
> Come death, and paſs life."

The cuſtom is found in many parts of England,[2] and it formed the ſubject of a communication to the "Athenæum" of the 17th of October, 1846, where it is ſtated that "it originates from the belief which formerly prevailed, that the ſoul flew out of the mouth of the dying in the likeneſs of a bird."

Thus, I think, we have ſtudied ſome preliminary chapters from the ſcience of folk-lore ſufficiently to form, at this ſtage, ſome ſort of outlook from which our future progreſs may be guided. The primitive homeſtead—as the homeſtead of uncivilized races of the preſent day—was the ſeat of ſuperſtitious beliefs and practices which, if not codified into a religion, at all events occupied the place of a primi-

[1] "Notes and Queries," 1ſt ſer., vol. v., p. 173.

[2] See the ſame cuſtom in Suſſex, "Folk-Lore Record," i., p. 60, and ſee upon the whole ſubject, "Choice Notes, Folk-Lore," p. 117.

tive ſyſtem of morality. The primitive villager, quick to revenge, with no complete conceptions of right between man and man, with ſtrong hatred to men of other communities, with paſſions untamed by philoſophy or culture, dared not deſecrate the homeſtead of his fellow villager becauſe it was ſurrounded by protectors from the ſpirit-world. That theſe early fancies in the mind of man developed a higher form of belief, is the propoſition that now meets us. The houſe ſo ſurrounded became the home of a houſe religion; and this houſe religion accordingly will be our next ſtage in the archaic rearrangement of Engliſh folk-lore.

Looking at the broad outline of the queſtion before us, it appears to me that we may thus ſtate our poſition. Archæology has diſcovered ſome of the forms of the primitive houſe; but it has not reſtored the aſſociations of the people who lived there. The bare walls, the unhewn ſtone, the thatched roofs, the earthen floor, are all that is preſented to the modern inquirer. Standing amidſt all theſe deſolations of hiſtory, the comparative folk-loriſt, by recalling the cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions—the thoughts and aſſociations—of people who lived in theſe primitive homes, reſtores too the life which once more makes the primitive village home a known factor in Engliſh hiſtory. Knowing now that the rude and meagre village hut was as ſacred as the walled caſtle, knowing that the local ſpirits of the homeſtead repreſented a force in the mind of primitive man, we ſhall be able to go forward into further reſearches prepared to meet the ſequence to all this in other parts of houſehold life.

CHAPTER V.

THE HOUSE SPIRITS.

IN primitive ſociety the family circle was completely hemmed in from the outer world. All that we have juſt now aſcertained belongs to the village, outſide the houſehold life of each villager; it is, in fact, the outer cruſt of primitive ideas through which we muſt penetrate to find the enormous accretions within. Inſide the houſe all was ſecret and unknown. A Hindu woman has an inſuperable objection to permitting a European to know aught of the internal economy of her houſe. The ſecrecy of domeſtic life forbids that a ſtranger ſhould ever be informed of anything ſo private as the mode in which a mother ſoothes her child to reſt.[1] Thus we ſee how the protective influences of the ſpirit-world, as deſcribed in the laſt chapter, bring about protective influences of early village ſocial laws, which proclaimed in no uncertain voice that the domiciles of primitive man,

[1] Gover's "Folk Songs of India," p. 138.

held ſacred to the ſpirit of the locality, muſt be held ſacred, too, from the intruſion of viſitors. This ſecrecy is maintained throughout India in very humble houſeholds, and under difficulties which at firſt ſight ſeem inſurmountable.[1] It is the key, ſays Sir Henry Maine, by which much that is not quite intelligible in early legal hiſtory may be explained. The public ſtate law, for inſtance, never in early ſociety penetrated this ſecrecy, and it is a "conjectural explanation of the ſcantineſs of ancient ſyſtems of law as they appear in the monument in which an attempt was made to ſet them formally forth, that the lawgiver merely attempted to fill, ſo to ſpeak, the interſtices between the families of which the aggregate formed the ſociety."[2] In exactly the ſame way I would attempt to explain that this family ſecrecy is the reaſon why morality and religion—the morality and religion of the moſt highly cultured of the nation—has been ſo long in ouſting from civilized ſociety the cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions which ſo extenſively exiſt. In the general advancement of a people (ſays Dr. Mitchell) there is always a going down of ſome and a going up of others. When we ſpeak of a nation's reaching a high ſtate of culture, it is never meant that all the individuals compoſing that nation, but only that ſome of them have reached it. A high civilization reaches all the members of a nation, but a high culture has never been known to do ſo.[3] The cuſtoms

[1] Sir Henry Maine's "Village Communities," p. 114.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 115.

[3] Mitchell's "The Paſt in the Preſent," p. 56.

and ſuperſtitions of family life, therefore, have remained very much as they were for centuries back mainly becauſe the ſtate law has not, and the ſtate religion could not penetrate into the ſtronghold.

From theſe facts it would appear to be in conformity with the general rule of ſocial development that in the houſehold, in matters of ſmall ſignificance or relating to things which belong to the nurſery and the early days of childhood, there ſhould ſtill remain ſome of the cuſtoms and old ideas of primitive life. Our Engliſh proverb, "Every Engliſhman's houſe is his caſtle,"[1] expreſſes the adheſion to the ſecrecy which is prevalent in primitive ſociety; and in the houſe, therefore, has been preſerved theſe many years, numerous relics of primitive life in Britain. The ſecrecy with which the believers in old cuſtoms and popular ſuperſtitions ſtill carry out their beliefs is well known. The ſtate of the New Zealander is ſomewhat akin to that of the Engliſh or Scotch peaſant. Shortland tells us of the chief Tarapipipi, who was a Chriſtian, that he had evidently not been able to entirely ſubdue the force of

[1] Müller, in his "Dorians," gives ſome intereſting parallels to this ſubject. "The Lacedæmonians held the doctrine that the door of his court was the boundary of every man's freedom; without, all owned the authority of the ſtate; within, the maſter of the houſe ruled as lord on his own ground." It was the cuſtom at Sparta not to knock, but to call, at the outer gate (Plutarch). The ſame was alſo the cuſtom among the Æolians, according to Alcæus, among the poems of Theocritus, xxix., 39 (vol. ii., p. 266). According to the ſuppoſed ſaying of Lycurgus, "firſt make a democracy in thine own houſe" (Plutarch, "Lycurgus").

early impreſſions. He would not acknowledge that he had any belief in the gods of his fathers; but he had ſtill a lingering dread of their power, which, though weakened, was not totally deſtroyed.[1] And in Scotland, Dr. Mitchell ſays, "when perſons are charged with taking part in ſome heatheniſh rite, and when its nature is honeſtly and roughly expreſſed, I have often been ſtruck with the embarraſſment which reſulted from a ſtruggle between a deſire to diſown all faith in it, and a fear of evil from doing ſo."[2]

Following out the plan of re-arranging in archaic ſequence the many cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions which now exiſt in our midſt and have their parallels in ſavage ſociety, we now conſider how the excluſiveneſs and ſacredneſs of the primitive houſehold is illuſtrated. By picking up the waifs and ſtrays of Engliſh local cuſtoms, and placing them in their reſtored archaic hiſtory, we ſhall ſee that the threſhold of the houſe was guarded by ceremonies and cuſtoms which, if ſignificant of anything, muſt be the prelude to important and ſacred cuſtoms within the houſe.

To ſtumble at the threſhold is in Engliſh folk-lore a moſt ominous ſign.[3] Shakeſpeare puts into the mouth of Glouceſter a reminiſcence of this ſuperſtition:

[1] Shortland's "Traditions and Superſtitions of the New Zealanders," p. 85.

[2] "The Paſt in the Preſent," p. 146.

[3] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 38; Aubrey's "Gentiliſme and Judaiſme," pp. 26, 56.

"For many men that ſtumble at the threſhold
Are well foretold that danger lurks within."
3 *Henry VI.*, act iv., sc. 7.

But when taken into the realms of ſavage cuſtom, it is a terrible affair. In a Polyneſian ſtory we read that a boy was ſent one day with a meſſage to Uenuku, who was an *ariki* or chief high prieſt, and the little fellow accidentally tripped and fell down in the very doorway of Wharekura, the houſe of Uenuku, and this being a moſt unlucky omen, Uenuku was dreadfully irritated, and he laid hold of the boy and ate him up.[1]

But the folk-lore of our iſlands ſupplies us with ſome definite evidence of how the threſhold was protected. As there was a ſacrifice at the foundation of the houſe, ſo there was at the threſhold. At St. Peter's, Athlone, every family of a village, ſays Maſon, in his "Statiſtical Account of Ireland" (iii., 75), kills an animal of ſome kind or other; thoſe who are rich kill a cow or a ſheep, others a gooſe or a turkey; while thoſe who are poor and cannot procure an animal of greater value, kill a hen or a cock, and ſprinkle the threſhold with the blood, and do the ſame in the four corners of the houſe, and this ceremonious performance is done to exclude every kind of evil ſpirit from the dwelling where this ſacrifice is made till the return of the ſame day the following year.[2] I cannot conceive anything more ſignificant than this ſingular cuſtom: without

[1] Grey's "Polyneſian Mythology," p. 202.
[2] See Dyer's "Popular Cuſtoms," p. 420.

any variation in form or motif, it belongs entirely to the primitive home-life of our anceſtors. We have other cuſtoms by which the entry of "fairies" was prevented, and they belong to the ſame group as the above, though not in ſo perfect a form. On May eve the juvenile branches of nearly every family in the Iſle of Man uſed to gather primroſes and ſtrew them before the doors of their dwellings, in order to prevent the entrance of fairies on that night.[1] And ſo for the admittance of a good fairy the ceremony at the threſhold was adopted. On the eve of the firſt day of February, a feſtival was formerly kept, called in the Manx language "laa'l Breeſhey," in honour of the Iriſh lady who went over to the Iſle of Man to receive the veil from St. Maughold. The cuſtom was to gather a bundle of green ruſhes, and ſtanding with them in the hand on the threſhold of the door, to invite the holy St. Bridget to come and lodge with them that night. In the Manx language the invitation ran thus:—"Brede, Brede, tar gys my thie, tar dyn thie ayms noght. Foſhil jee yn dorrys da Brede, as lhig da Brede e heet ſtaigh." In Engliſh:—"Bridget, Bridget, come to my houſe, come to my houſe to-night. Open the door for Bridget, and let Bridget come in." After theſe words were re-

[1] Train's "Hiſtory of the Iſle of Man," ii., p. 117. Among the Pagan feſtivals which were moſt ſtrenuouſly kept up at the birth of the Chriſtian religion and during its ſpread over the Roman empire, Gibbon ſpecially mentions the decoration of the doors with lamps and branches of laurel—the doors being under the protection of the houſehold gods ("Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" (Murray), i., p. 344).

peated, the ruſhes were ſtrewn on the floor by way of a carpet or bed for St. Bridget. A cuſtom very ſimilar to this was alſo obſerved in ſome of the Out-Iſles of the ancient kingdom of Man.[1]

The protection of the threſhold from the influences of witchcraft is alſo a ſpecial function of folk-lore. It was cuſtomary to place under the entrance door a jug filled with horſe-ſhoe nails, to prevent the entrance of witches.[2] "To this purpoſe," ſays Aubrey, "we ſtill uſe frequently to naile a horſe-ſhoe (found by chance) on the threſhold of the dore; nothing more common and moſt uſed in London."[3] This cuſtom is ſtill prevalent in Scotland. To find a horſe-ſhoe (ſays Mr. Napier), "and hang it behind the houſe-door, was conſidered to bring good luck to the houſehold, and protection from witchcraft or evil eye."[4] And it is to be met with in China, in a ſlightly different form. "Of the charms affixed to buildings," ſays Mr. Dennys, "the Chineſe have a fair variety. The all-potent horſe-ſhoe is, indeed, not found nailed againſt doors and gables; but, oddly enough, a horſe's hoof hung up in the houſe has the ſame preſervative effect in native eyes."[5]

I think, too, there is ſome indication of the ancient ſacredneſs of the houſe in the ſecrecy once

[1] Train's "Hiſtory of the Iſle of Man," ii., p. 116.

[2] "Notes and Queries," 1ſt ſer., vi., p. 271; 4th ſer., vi., p. 114.

[3] "Remains of Gentiliſme and Judaiſme," p. 204.

[4] Napier's "Folk-Lore of Weſt of Scotland," p. 139.

[5] Dennys' "Folk-Lore of China," p. 48.

attending the act of courtſhip. In Cumberland "the youth viſits his ſweetheart at her home. Theſe viſits are moſt commonly made on the Saturday evenings. After the family are gone to bed, the fire darkened, and the candle extinguiſhed, he cautiouſly enters the houſe. In this murky ſituation they remain for a few hours. . . . . With theſe proceedings the parents or maſters of the lovers are well enough acquainted. When the marriage is nearly concluded on, and it is underſtood that the girl's parents have no objection to the match, the young man ventures to ſhow himſelf." [1]

And thus, when we come to the intruſion of a new inmate to the houſe, the bride of the houſe-father—the houſe-mother that is to be,—the ceremony of lifting her over the threſhold of her huſband's door is found to be a neceſſary element in the rite. The marriage ceremony is ſymbolical of a great many features of primitive life; but there are three eſpecial ſtages which may be clearly and unmistakably defined. We ſhall preſently ſee the duties of the bride or houſe-mother, and the ceremonies attending her new degree, after ſhe has paſſed within the domain of her lord and maſter; and hereafter we ſhall ſee ſomething of the village ceremony before her arrival at the threſhold of her new home. Here, however, we muſt pauſe, in order to point out that whatever may be the cuſtoms before and after, the paſſing over the threſhold was an important ſtage in the village marriage cere-

[1] Jollie's "Manners and Cuſtoms of Cumberland," 1811, pp. 39, 40.

mony. The bride being lifted over the threſhold, and the cake being broken over her head, are cuſtoms to be found in many ſavage ſocieties. We meet with the key to the matter in the Fiji cuſtom, limited as it is, however, to the temple, or the chief's houſe. To ſit on the threſhold of a temple is *tabu* to any but a chief of the higheſt rank. All are careful not to tread on the threſhold of a place ſet apart for the gods: perſons of rank ſtride over, others paſs over on hands and knees. The ſame form is obſerved in croſſing the threſhold of a chief's houſe.[1]

The Chineſe throw rice over the head of the bride as ſhe returns to her future home; and, in Sicily, wheat is ſimilarly thrown.[2] On her arrival ſhe was not to be allowed to touch the threſhold. In China, the entrance is uſually covered with red cloth for this purpoſe. In ſome parts of the country ſhe is lifted out of the ſedan over a pan of charcoal placed in the court, and carried to her chamber.[3] This cuſtom of lifting the bride over the threſhold of her huſband's houſe is to be found alſo among the Red-ſkins of America, and among the Abyſſinians.[4]

Henderſon gives us the Engliſh cuſtom: "As the newly-married wife enters her new home on returning from kirk, one of the oldeſt inhabitants of the neighbourhood, who has been ſtationed on the threſhold, throws a plateful of ſhort-bread over her

[1] Williams's "Fiji and the Fijians," i., p. 233.
[2] Dennys' "Folk-Lore of China," p. 15.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[4] Lubbock's "Origin of Civilization," p. 122.

head, ſo that it falls outſide. A ſcramble enſues, for it is deemed very fortunate to get a piece of the ſhort-bread, and dreams of ſweethearts attend its being placed under the pillow. A variation of this cuſtom extends as far ſouth as the Eaſt Riding of Yorkſhire, where, on the bride's arrival at her father's door, a plate of cake is flung from an upper window upon the crowd below. An augury is then drawn from the fate which attends the plate: the more pieces it breaks into the better; if it reach the ground unbroken, the omen is very unfavourable." [1]

Mr. Gregor's account of the cuſtom in Scotland is ſtill more indicative of its origin in the primitive ſacredneſs of the threſhold: When the bride arrived, ſhe was welcomed by the bridegroom's mother, if alive. If ſhe was dead, the welcome was given by one of the bridegroom's neareſt relatives. When paſſing over the threſhold there was held over the bride's head a ſieve containing bread and cheeſe, which were diſtributed among the gueſts. They were ſometimes ſcattered around her, when there was a ruſh made by the young folks to ſecure a piece. At times an oatmeal cake was broken over her head. In later times a thin cake of "ſhort-bread," called the bride cake, was ſubſtituted for the oatmeal cake. It was diſtributed among the gueſts, who carefully preſerved it, particularly the unmarried, who placed it below their pillows to "dream on." In ſome diſtricts, when the ſieve was

[1] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 36.

in the act of being placed over her head, or the bread broken, it was the bridegroom's duty to ſnatch her from below it.[1]

There are other cuſtoms which belong to this ſame group. In remote parts of Yorkſhire it is the cuſtom to pour a kettleful of boiling water over the doorſtep, juſt after the bride has left her old home; and they ſay that before it dries up another marriage is ſure to be agreed on.[2] No doubt we have here an altered form, incidental to the nature of ſurvivals from primitive cuſtoms, of the cuſtoms before deſcribed as taking place at the huſband's threſhold, becauſe, among the ancient Romans, we find that fire and water are placed upon the bridegroom's threſhold. But from Brand we get a clear ſurvival of the ancient ceremony. There was an

[1] Gregor's "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," pp. 92, 93; ſee alſo Napier's "Folk-Lore of Weſt of Scotland," pp. 46 *et ſeq.*, and Dalyell's "Darker Superſtitions of Scotland," p. 292.

The cuſtom of breaking a cake over the bride's head, originally belonging entirely to the realms of folk-lore, was adopted by the Church in ſome caſes. Walker relates, in his "Sufferings of the Clergy," how a miniſter of Rotherfield, in Suſſex, was ſummoned to anſwer ſome charges preferred againſt him, among which he was accuſed of "being ſuperſtitiously inclin'd for breaking a cake over a bride's head;" to which he anſwered, "yt he had indeed broake a cake, as was uſuall in his pariſh for the miniſter over a bride's head; yt 'twas a cuſtom which had long prevailed in his pariſh, and wch he thought might be inoffenſive in itſelf, neither good nor bad, as many other received cuſtoms were" (see "Suſſex Arch. Coll., vol. xxxi., p. 178).

[2] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 40.

ancient ſuperſtition (he writes) that the bride was not to ſtep over the threſhold in entering the bridegroom's houſe, but was to be lifted over by her neareſt relations. She was alſo to knit her fillets to the doorpoſts, and anoint the ſides, to avoid the miſchievous faſcinations of witches.[1] Herrick, in his "Heſperides," deſcribes the cuſtoms :—

"And now the yellow vaile, at laſt,
Over her fragrant cheek is caſt.
* * * * *
You, you that be of her neereſt kin
Now o're the threſhold force her in.
But to avert the worſt,
Let her her fillets firſt
Knit to the poſts ; this point
Rememb'ring, to anoint
The ſides, for 'tis a charme
Strong againſt future harme,
And the evil deads, the which
There was hidden by the witch."

Again, when digging deeper into the mines of folk-lore, which, when taken up as a living element of human life, in the ſame way as language exiſts, aſſumes ſhapes and forms differing from the original ſtandard, we come acroſs variants of this cuſtom at the threſhold. The houſe-father's threſhold loſes its importance when the houſe-religion is reduced to a ſuperſtitious ſurvival by the influences of Chriſtianity. But the original cuſtom, perſiſtent in its long life, is eaſily transferred from the houſe-altar to the church-altar. Chriſtianity did not always eradicate primitive cuſtoms, but adapted them to Church

[1] Brand's "Popular Antiquities," ii., pp. 169, 170.

uſages. So it is with this protection of the threſhold. We find that Mr. Henderſon puts on record very clearly the evidence of its transfer from the houſe to the church: "A ſingular cuſtom prevails at the village of Belford, in Northumberland, of making the bridal pair with their attendants leap over a ſtone placed in their path at the outſide of the church porch. This is called the louping ſtone, or petting ſtone, and it is ſaid on the ſpot that the bride muſt leave all her pets and humours behind her when ſhe croſſes it. At the neighbouring village of Embleton, two ſtout young lads place a wooden bench acroſs the door of the church porch, aſſiſt the bride and bridegroom and their friends to ſurmount the obſtacle, and then look out for a donation from the bridegroom. The Vicar of Embleton conſiders it to be connected with ſome ſuperſtition as to touching the threſhold or the building, or ſtumbling upon it. At a wedding in a High-Coquetdale family, it was propoſed to have a petted ſtone. A ſtick was therefore held by two groomſmen at the church door for the bride to jump over. Had ſhe fallen or ſtumbled, the worſt auguries as to her temper would have been drawn. At the church of Bamburgh, during a wedding, the following ſcene took place: The ceremony ended, on leaving the church, a three-legged ſtool, about a foot high, was placed at the churchyard gate, and covered with about two yards of carpet. The whole of the bridal party had ſeparately to hop or jump over this ſtool, aſſiſted on either ſide by a ſtalwart villager."[1]

[1] "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 38.

Now Dr. Hearn, in his valuable work the "Aryan Houſehold," attributes this profound reſerve and ſecrecy of the primitive houſehold to the ſpecial and excluſive worſhip of the hearth.[1] And looking back upon all that has been collected from Engliſh folk-lore about the ſacredneſs of the houſe, how narrowly it was guarded from hoſtile or inquiſitive intruſion, how clearly it was protected by the ſpirit world, the queſtion becomes almoſt a natural one to aſk, is there not alſo a houſe-god and a houſe-worſhip to be diſcovered from Engliſh folk-lore, juſt as we have diſcovered that Engliſh folk-lore contains ſo many germs of primitive cuſtom relating to the houſe and its poſition in the village?

Let us, firſt of all, ſee what the houſe-god and houſe-worſhip is in primitive ſociety. There can be no queſtion but that its germs lie much deeper than Aryan civilization. Dr. Hearn rightly looks upon the houſe-worſhip as a belief in the ſpirit rule of deceaſed anceſtors.[2] This worſhip, we know, goes far back into ſavage ſociety. But beſides this there are many other cuſtoms too much in accordance with what has already been noted reſpecting the ſacredneſs of the houſe, to ſuppoſe that they can be parallel in form without being parallel in *motif*.

Thus, among the Samoans, the houſe was built by direction of the family god. It could never under any circumſtances paſs from the family.[3]

[1] "Aryan Houſehold," p. 118.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[3] Pritchard's "Polyneſian Reminiſcences," p. 109.

Among the New Zealanders, again, houſes are accounted ſacred to the uſe of the perſons for whom they are built; and rarely, after a battle, when every ſavage enormity has been perpetrated, are the houſes of the murdered proprietors made uſe of by the victors. Such places are deſerted and left to decay in ruin, and the fallen and rotten framework, after years of diſuſe, is not allowed to be made uſe of as firewood.[1] The principle here involved is only putting ſavage cuſtom in a little ſtronger light than has already been ſeen. In the Samoan inſtance, there is the remarkable fact, that the houſe was built under the direction of the family god. To this family god, we are told by Mr. Pritchard, the father of the houſehold prayed when the evening meal was ſpread. This god was ſpiritually preſent in the houſe which the head of the family occupied. At certain times family gatherings were held, when a feaſt was provided in honour of the god, and a bowl of ava was ſolemnly and ſlowly poured on the ground as a propitiatory drink-offering.[2] At the evening meal the whole family aſſemble and eat together. Before any one began to eat, the head of the family, pouring a portion of his ava upon the ground, "ſaid grace" after the following manner: "This is your ava, O ye our gods. Remember this our family. Let our number increaſe. Let us all live in health. Let us all grow ſtrong. We are your people, O ye, our gods.

[1] Polack's "Manners and Cuſtoms of the New Zealanders," i., pp. 204, 216.

[2] "Polyneſian Reminiſcences," p. 108.

Then give to us food to eat. Let there be plenty, and make our plantations to flouriſh and all things good to eat. Ye alſo, the gods of war! This is ava for you. Make ſtrong, make brave, make numerous the people in this our land. Ye alſo the gods that ſail the ſea! This is your ava. Paſs this our land and ſail into another land." When there was no ava prepared, the head of the family prayed by the light of the fire. In every houſe there is a fire-place in the centre. Before going to eat, the fire was made to blaze up well, and the patriarch began his prayer, addreſſing firſt his family god, and then the whole hoſt of gods.[1]

Here, then, we have the anceſtral ſpirit worſhipped and ſacrificed to at the family hearth. How clearly this worſhip at the hearth is held ſacred to the anceſtral ſpirits of the family is perhaps better ſeen from the cuſtoms of the Ovahereró, a tribe of South Africans, among whom every important occurrence connected with the family—birth, marriage, ſickneſs, death—is aſſociated with the ſacred hearth. I ſhall ſpeak of the different cuſtoms incidental to each of theſe occaſions when we come to conſider them in their order, but it muſt be noted here that the Ovahereró are the only tribe of which we have ſuch complete evidence. We have ſeen in the previous chapter that the Ovahereró deſerted their habitations upon a death taking place within. The cuſtom which attends the re-occupation of theſe deſerted places enables us to obtain a full conception of the worſhip paid to anceſtors at the ſacred houſe-

[1] "Polyneſian Reminiſcences," p. 124.

fire when they return to the old werft, as it is called: "the holy fire of the werft where they have been living is extinguiſhed, and as a rule they take no brand of the holy fire with them to the old werft whither they return, but holy fire muſt now be obtained from the anceſtral deity. . . . When the people have arrived near the werft they make diſmal lamentation for the dead, and when the fire is made on the old okuruo (place of the holy fire), a ſheep is ſlaughtered near it, which is called 'that of the fire.'"[1] Each head of a houſehold, we are told elſewhere, poſſeſſes an okuruo of his own, which is conſidered to be inferior in importance to that of the prieſt.[2]

I will now mention one or two more examples of the houſe religion of ſavage ſociety, and then paſs on. In Japan, "Dai Gakf," "the great black one," is worſhipped as the god of riches. He is repreſented as a little man with a large ſack on his ſhoulders, and a hammer in his hand. His proper place is in the kitchen, and he is always found placed near the hearth.[3]

Among the New Zealanders there was a houſehold god, an image in the form of an infant, which belonged ſolely to females; this was nurſed by thoſe who were barren as if it were a baby; it was made with great care and generally as large as a child, adorned with the family jewels and the ſame gar-

[1] South African "Folk-Lore Journal," i., pp. 61-62.

[2] *Ibid.*, ii., p. 113.

[3] Rev. S. Beal, in the "Academy" of July 3rd, 1880. This is exactly parallel to the Greek God Hephaeſtus, dwarf-like figures of whom were placed near the hearth.—*Ibid.*

ments that they uſually wear, and was addreſſed in the ſame endearing terms.[1] But further on in the ſame volume (p. 501), we have the following remarkable piece of information:—"The ridge pole of the houſe is ſupported by a pillar in the middle of the houſe, the bottom of which is carved in the form of a human figure, repreſenting the founder of the family; immediately before the face of this figure is the fire-place"—the whole incidents belonging to hearth-worſhip. The Nicobar iſlanders had at the entrance of their houſes a wooden figure of a man, from half to three-quarters life-ſize, the tutelary deity of the place.[2]

At the ſacrifice of the White Dog, the New Year's feſtival of the Iroquois, the proceedings extended over ſix days. The ſtrangling of the white dog deſtined for ſacrifice was the chief feature of the firſt day's proceedings. On the ſecond day the two keepers of the faith viſited each houſe and performed the ſignificant ceremony of ſtirring the aſhes on the hearth, accompanied with a thankſgiving to the Great Spirit. On the morning of the fifth day the fire was ſolemnly kindled by friction, and the white dog was borne in proceſſion on a bark litter, until the officiating leaders halted, facing the riſing ſun, when it was laid upon the flaming wood and conſumed.[3]

[1] Taylor's "Te Ika a Maui, or New Zealand and its Inhabitants," p. 213.

[2] "Calcutta Review," vol. li. (1870), p. 274.

[3] "League of the Iroquois," pp. 207-221, quoted in Prof. D. Wilſon's "Pre-hiſtoric Man," i., p. 146. Among all the

Among the aborigines of Victoria no one ever ſpat in the fire, as it would cauſe ſome unknown injury to the perſon ſo offending.[1] The Mongols have a place for offerings to their gods juſt inſide the entrance.[2] Among the Bunjogees ſacrifice is offered inſide the houſe.[3] In each houſe among the Dard communities, the fire-place conſiſts of three upright ſtones, of which the one at the back of the hearth is the largeſt. On this ſtone they place an offering for the Lha-mo from every diſh cooked there before they eat. They alſo place there the firſt fruits of the harveſt. Such is their houſehold religion.[4]

Now, although I think we can perceive in the Aryan anceſtor worſhip at the hearth certain indications of new lines of departure from the ſavage worſhip—lines of departure, that is, which have led on to civilization—yet we cannot doubt but that the germs of this hearth-worſhip lie far behind Aryan hiſtory.[5] But to get fairly at the Engliſh ſurvivals

Indian tribes, not only was a certain ſuperſtitious ſanctity attached to fire, but they looked with diſtruſt on the novel methods employed by Europeans for its production (Wilſon's "Pre-hiſtoric Man," i., 149.)

[1] "Tranſactions of Ethnological Society," i., 300.

[2] *Ibid.*, i., 98.

[3] Lewin's "Wild Races of S. E. India," p. 244.

[4] Biddulph's "Tribes of the Hindoo Kooſh," p. 51. Here is a curious example in European folk-lore. There are places in Lithuania where the inhabitants adore a Domeſtic God, called *Dinſtipan*, that is, *The Director of the Smoke or Chimneys* (Bekker's "World Bewitched," 1695, p. 49).

[5] Conſult Farrer's "Primitive Manners and Cuſtoms," pp. 296-302.

of this primitive worſhip we muſt aſcertain what the Aryan cuſtom was. Agni is pre-eminently the regulator of ſacrifices, and, as ſuch, anſwers to the Greek Heſtia and the Latin Veſta, the deities of the houſehold hearth and ſanctuary.[1] The family is held together by the family ſacra, ſays Sir Henry Maine,[2] and Profeſſor Max Müller adds that many traces remain to ſhow that the hearth was the firſt altar, the father the firſt elder, his wife, and childeen, and ſlaves the firſt congregation gathered together round the ſacred fire, the Heſtia, the goddeſs of the houſe, and in the end the goddeſs of the people.[3]

We have now to deal with Engliſh folk-lore, then, in reſpect of its adherence to the old home-life of the primitive world, where there is the anceſtral houſe-god, whoſe chief prieſt is the houſe-father, whoſe altar is the hearth, and whoſe element is the ever-burning ſacred fire.

That the hearth is the reſidence of the houſe-god is to be illuſtrated by many ſcraps of our fairy mythology. In a ſeventeenth century work quoted by Brand, we read "Doth not the warm zeal of an Engliſhman's devotion (who was ever obſerved to contend moſt ſtifly *pro aris et focis*) make him

[1] Cox's "Introduction to Mythology and Folk-Lore," p. 166.

[2] "Ancient Law," p. 191.

[3] "Lectures on the Science of Religion," p. 152. I muſt refer here to Mr. Ralſton's "Songs of the Ruſſian People," pp. 119-139, for the important Ruſſian ceremonies of this ancient cult. Muller's "Dorians," vol. ii., pp. 199, 232, gives ſome uſeful notes.

maintain and defend the ſacred hearth, as the ſanctuary and chief place of reſidence of the tutelary lares and houſehold gods, and the only court where the lady fairies convene to dance and revel" (ii. 504). Maids are puniſhed by the fairies (fairies being the generic folk-lore title for the primitive houſehold gods) for untidy houſehold habits, and particularly for not attending properly to the hearth. Thus in the old ballad of "Robin Goodfellow" it is ſaid,

> "Where fires thou find'ſt unraked and hearths unſwept,
> There pinch the maids as blue as bilbery."

In Ireland the fairies are believed to viſit the farm-houſes in their diſtrict on particular nights, and the embers are collected, the hearth ſwept, and a veſſel of water placed for their uſe before the family retire to reſt;[1] Spenſer obſerves that at the kindling of the fire and lighting of candles they ſay certain prayers, and uſe ſome other ſuperſtitious rites, which ſhow that they honour the fire and the light;[2] and in an old diary, printed by the Kilkenny Archæological Society (vol. i. [n. s.], p. 183), we read that "ſervants when they ſcour andirons, fire-ſhovell, or tongues, ſetting them down make a courteſie to each."

Drayton, in the "Nymphidia," records a piece of genuine traditional folk-lore in the following lines:—

> "Hence ſhadows, ſeeming idle ſhapes
> Of little friſking Elves and Apes,

[1] Croker's "Reſearches in the South of Ireland," p. 84.
[2] Spenſer's "View of the State of Ireland," p. 98.

To earth do make their wanton ſcapes,
As hope of paſtime haſtes them;
Which maids think on the hearth they ſee
When fires well near conſumed be,
Theſe dancing hayes by two and three,
Juſt as their fancy caſts them."

The ſame idea is given by Reginald Scott. "Indeed, your grandam's maids were wont to ſet a bowl of milk before him (Incubus) and his couſin Robin Goodfellow, for grinding of malt or muſtard, and ſweeping the houſe at midnight."[1]

Shakeſpeare, too, deſcribes ſome of the acts of Robin Goodfellow as thoſe of the houſehold fairy:—

"Either I miſtake your ſhape and making quite,
Or elſe you are that *ſhrewd* and *knaviſh ſprite*,
Call'd *Robin Goodfellow:* are you not he,
That fright the maidens of the villagery?
Skim milk, and ſometimes labour in the quern,
And bootleſs make the breathleſs houſewife churn?
And ſometimes make the drink to bear no barm?
Miſlead night wanderers, *laughing* at their harm?
Thoſe that *Hobgoblin* call you and ſweet Puck,
You do their works, and they ſhall have *good luck:*
Are not you he?"

But the other characteriſtics, ſays Tſchiſchwitz, in his "Shakſpere Forſchungen," Part II., alſo anſwer to the nature of the German "*Hauſgeiſt.*" Grimm tells us that "dirty and negligent ſervants will be puniſhed by the goblin; he pulls off the bedcovers of the lazy, blows out their candle, twiſts the neck

[1] Reginald Scott's "Dæmonology," p. 980. See Keightley's "Fairy Mythology," ii., 108.

of the beſt cow, knocks over the pail of ſlovenly milkmaids, ſo that the milk is ſpilt, and then mocks them with ſcornful laughter."

But the houſe-ſpirit, as repreſented by the modern fairy, is not quite a true ſurvival of ancient ideas. The fairy has been influenced by literature, and we do not get his primitive form. By turning to the Scandinavian outſkirts of our land, the hearth-ſpirits appear as a living belief. Not above forty or fifty years ago, ſays Brand, in his "Deſcription of Orkney, Zetland, &c.," almoſt every family had a "Brownie, or evil ſpirit, ſo called, who ſerved them, to whom they gave a ſacrifice for its ſervice; as when they churned their milk they took a part thereof, and ſprinkled every corner of the houſe with it for Brownie's uſe; likewiſe when they brewed they had a ſtone, which they called Brownie's ſtone, wherein there was a little hole into which they poured ſome wort for a ſacrifice to Brownie."[1] We get a glimpſe of the ſame living belief in the hearth-ſpirit in Ireland. Among the Iriſh the expreſſion "the breaking of cinders" means to charge and confirm guilt on a man at his own hearth, ſo that his fire, which repreſents his honour, is broken up into cinders. The trampling of a man's cinders was one of the greateſt inſults which could be offered to him, as it conveyed the idea of guilt, and not only on the individual himſelf, but alſo on his family and houſehold.[2] Dr. Hearn, who uſes this remarkable piece of evidence, obſerves that we may well believe that

[1] Keightley's "Fairy Mythology," ii., pp. 273, 274.

[2] Sullivan's Introd. to O'Curry's "Lectures," i., p. cclxxviii.

we have here a memorial of the time when the hearth was the centre and the ſhrine of the family, and when the fortunes of its head brought a like fortune to every member of the houſehold.[1] By turning to ſome other cuſtoms we ſhall find this more fully exemplified.

In the Weſtern Iſles of Scotland, as Candlemas Day comes round, the miſtreſs and ſervants of each family, taking a ſheaf of oats, dreſs it up in woman's apparel, and after putting it in a large baſket, beſide which a wooden club is placed, they cry three times, "Brüd is come, Brüd is welcome." This they do juſt before going to bed, and as ſoon as they riſe in the morning they look among the aſhes, expecting to ſee the impreſſion of Brüd's club there, which if they do, they reckon it a true preſage of a good crop and proſperous year.[2] The ſame conception is more generally expreſſed in the Manx cuſtoms. In many of the upland cottages it is cuſtomary for the houſewife, after raking the fire for the night, and juſt before ſtepping into bed, to ſpread the aſhes smooth over the floor with the tongs, in the hope of finding in it, next morning, the trace of a foot; ſhould the toes of this ominous print point towards the door, then it is believed a member of the family will die in the courſe of the year; but ſhould the heel of the fairy foot point in that direction, then it is firmly believed that the family will be augmented within the ſame period.[3]

[1] "Aryan Houſehold," p. 51.

[2] Martin's "Weſtern Iſles," p. 119.

[3] Train's "Hiſtory of the Iſle of Man," ii., p. 115; alſo

All theſe cuſtoms carry us unmiſtakably to the old homes of our primitive anceſtors, where the hearth was ſacred to the anceſtral houſe-ſpirit. It is not the province of the ſcience of folk-lore to ſettle why they are extant now: it only knows of them as a living factor in modern popular ſuperſtition, and alſo a living factor in primitive every-day belief; and it argues that, if primitive in the one caſe, they muſt be primitive in the other caſe. From Cornwall I have obtained a note of a cuſtom which is, to all intents and purpoſes, a hearth ſacrifice. The practice of reſorting to the hearth, and touching the cravel (the mantle-ſtone acroſs the head of an open chimney) with the forehead, and caſting into the fire a handful of dry graſs, or anything picked up that will burn, is regarded as the moſt effectual means of averting any impending evils of a myſterious nature.[1] How could folk-lore ſpeak plainer than this? It declares that the threſhold was ſacred becauſe beyond it lay the ſacred-hearth and the dwelling of the houſe-ſpirit.

The fire on the ſacred hearth was never allowed to go out. Of this cuſtom there are ſome very wide-ſpread examples. In New Zealand it was rarely that the fires were wholly extinguiſhed in a

Hampſon's "Medii Ævi Kal.," i., p. 221. Compare Mr. Lang's parallel example from Auſtralia in Preface to "Folk-Lore Record," vol. ii., p. ii., alſo Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of Northern Counties," p. 51.

[1] Bottrell's "Stories and Folk-Lore of Weſt Cornwall," 3rd ſeries, p. 17. For another curious chimney cuſtom, ſee "Folk-Lore Record," v., p. 160.

village, and it was uſual when a family had their fires extinguiſhed to ſend to their neighbours for ſome burning embers.[1] Among ſome tribes of the North American Indians the fire is uſually kept burning night and day.[2] Theſe have not the full ſignificance of the Aryan cuſtom, but they ſhow how far back in the hiſtory of man begins the permanence of cuſtom, and how this permanence is made poſſible by the practice of adapting old cuſtoms to new ideas and wants. Early Aryan hiſtory is very poſitive about the houſe-fire being ever burning,[3] and there are traces of the primitive practice in Engliſh folk-lore. Formerly throughout England the houſe-fires were allowed to go out on Eaſter Sunday, after which the chimney and fireplace were completely cleaned and the fire once more lighted.[4] Similarly in the Iſle of Man, Train ſays that "not a family in the whole iſland, of natives, but keeps a fire conſtantly burning; no one daring to depend on his neighbour's vigilance in a thing which he imagines is of ſo much conſequence; and every one firmly believing that if it ſhould ever happen that no fires were to be found throughout the iſland, the moſt terrible revolutions and miſchiefs would immediately enſue."[5] A curious relic of fire-worſhip

[1] Polack's "Manners and Cuſtoms of the New Zealanders," p. 165.

[2] Bancroft's "Native Races of the Pacific States of North America," i., p. 102; cf. Brinton's "Myths of the New World," pp. 140-148.

[3] Kelly's "Indo-European Folk-Lore," cap. ii.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 47.

[5] Train's "Hiſtory of Iſle of Man," i., p. 316.

exiſts in Scotland. It is called the feſtival of "The Clavie," and takes place each 12th of January at Burghead, a fiſhing village on the coaſt. A tar-barrel is burnt, and as it falls into pieces the fiſher-wives ruſh in and endeavour to get a lighted bit of firewood. With this the fire on the cottage hearth is at once kindled. It is conſidered lucky to keep this flame all the reſt of the year.

In Ireland on no account would either fire or water—but above all things, a coal of fire, even the kindling of a pipe—be given for love or money out of a houſe during the entire of May Day. The piece of lighted turf uſed to kindle another fire is ſtyled the ſeed of the fire; and this people endeavoured to procure from the bonfire of the previous night, and to keep it alive in the aſhes to light the fire on May morning.[1]

This laſt example is a modernized variant of the more primitive cuſtoms noticed in England, Scotland, and the Iſle of Man. How it might have ſtill further varied had it not thus become enſhrined in literature is curiouſly illuſtrated by the introduction of the "kindling of a pipe." If we had ſimply come acroſs the cuſtom that it was unlucky to give light for a pipe in Ireland on May Day, there would have been ſome difficulty in getting this accepted as a ſurvival from primitive hearth-worſhip. Yet in the above record we can well ſee how the proceſs of variation goes on. Nothing is more curious or inſtructive in the ſtudy of folk-lore than to note the variants that different cuſtoms take in different

[1] Wilde's "Iriſh Popular Superſtitions," p. 55.

places. Thus from there being an ever-burning fire, it has come to be that the fire muſt not be allowed to be extinguiſhed on the laſt day of the old year, ſo that the old year's fire may laſt into the new year. In Lanarkſhire it is conſidered unlucky to give out a light to any one on the morning of the new year, and therefore if the houſe-fire has been allowed to become extinguiſhed, recourſe muſt be had to the embers of the village pile.[1] In ſome places the ſelf-extinction of the yule-log at Chriſtmas is portentous of evil. A portion of the old log of the preceding year is ſometimes ſaved to light up the new log at the next Chriſtmas to preſerve the family from harm in the meanwhile.[2] Herrick ſays of this :—

> "With the laſt yeeres brand
> Light the new block, and
> For good ſucceſſe in his ſpending.
> On your pſaltries play,
> That ſweet luck may
> Come while the log is a tending."

Again, the candle that is lighted on Chriſtmas Day muſt be ſo large as to burn from the time of its ignition to the cloſe of the day, otherwiſe it will portend evil to the family for the enſuing year.[3] Another variant of the original cuſtom takes us even ſtill farther from the old hearth-fires. Formerly at Lyme Regis the wood-aſhes of the family being ſold throughout the year as they were made, the

[1] Dyer's "Popular Cuſtoms," p. 506.
[2] Hampſon's "Medii Ævi Kal.," i., p. 116.
[3] Hampſon, *loc. cit.*, i., p. 109.

perſon who purchaſed them annually ſent a preſent on Candlemas Day of a large candle. When night came this candle was lighted, and aſſiſted by its illumination the inmates regaled themſelves with cheering draughts of ale and ſippings of punch until the candle had burnt out, the ſignal for reſt being the ſelf-extinction of the Candlemas candle.[1] One can ſcarcely help recognizing in this the modern folk-lore form of the ſacred hearth-fire.[2]

[1] Dyer's "Popular Cuſtoms," p. 56.

[2] Dr. Hearn ſummarizes this ſubject in a few ſhort ſentences, which I ſhall tranſcribe here:—Notwithſtanding all hoſtile influences, the Teutonic Haus-geiſt has left many traces of his individuality. He is known as the Huſing or Stetigot, the Houſe god or *Lar Familiaris*. "We can often trace in them," ſays Grimm, "a ſpecial relation to the hearth of the houſe, from beneath which they often come forth, and where the door of their ſubterranean dwelling ſeems to have been; they are peculiarly hearth gods" ("Deutſche Mythol.," vol. i. 468). The Houſe ſpirits had a multitude of names which it is needleſs here to enumerate, but all of which are more or leſs expreſſive of their friendly relations with man. They always dwell in or about the houſe, and are, if they are well treated, always friendly and helpful in the houſe and in the yard. The name of Kobold appears in Normandy, and hence probably in England under the familiar form of Goblin. In the latter country he has many names. He is the Brownie, or, as in Yorkſhire, he is called the Boggart, or Hob Goblin, or Robin Goodfellow. By whatever ſtyle he is deſcribed, his fee is white bread and milk; and overnight he does all the houſehold work. The Iriſh repreſentative of the Houſe is ſaid to be the Cluricaun. In the Hebrides at the preſent day "the Gael call their evil ſpirits Boduchs (Boddus), while the word still retains its ancient ſecondary ſignification of old man, head of the family" ("The Aryan Houſehold," by W. E. Hearn, pp. 45-47).

There are many other cuſtoms which belong equally to this chapter of primitive houſehold life. The variants which modern folk-lore ſupply ſhade off into many degrees of ſimilarity to the primitive cuſtom, until we loſe ſight almoſt of every feature that is ancient. To rightly graſp the ſignificance of modern popular cuſtoms, this is what we muſt continually look for, and continually hope to find; and when every item of folk-lore is thus placed in its relation to the primitive cuſtoms of our anceſtors, the reſiduum, it appears to me, would be inſignificant in extent, and generally traceable to ſome ſpecial cauſe of modern ſuperſtition. But we muſt ſtop far ſhort of this now, and be content with the illuſtrative examples given above.

Before leaving the ever-burning hearth-fire of the primitive houſehold, I have one more feature of it to touch upon. It takes us a little beyond the houſe into the village, but as I do not propoſe dealing with the village cuſtoms in the preſent work, it is adviſable to mention the connection of the houſe cuſtom with the village cuſtom here. Over and over again in Aryan hiſtory we come acroſs evidence to prove that the communal family was the prototype of the communal tribe or village. What was incidental to the one was incidental in another degree to the other. Thus as every family had its ſacred hearth, ſo the city, the tribe, and the clan had each its own altar or hearth, where alone the common worſhip of each might be held. In the Prytaneion of each town (ſays Sir George Cox) the ſacred fire burning on the public hearth was

never ſuffered to go out. If, however, at any time it went out, it was reſtored by fire obtained by rubbing together pieces of wood or by kindling them with a burning-glaſs.[1] Now this village hearth is repreſented in Engliſh folk-lore by the Beltan fires ſo common a few years back. Already in the Lanarkſhire cuſtom we have ſeen the houſe-fire lighted from the village fire; and thus we get an almoſt complete ſurvival of the ancient cuſtom. As at preſent placed in folk-lore ſtudies, the Beltan fires do not tell us very much of the early hiſtory of our anceſtors. Once reſtore them to their archaic poſition, once trace out their place in the re-arrangement of folk-lore in archaic inſtead of literary ſequence, and they tell us a hiſtory the magnitude of which is hardly realizable.

If the ſacred hearth-fire was to be kept up continually, there muſt be ſome appointed perſon peculiarly fitted and deſtined for this office. We find her in the houſe-mother.[2] That this was ſo is, I think, evidenced by many peculiar cuſtoms now attached to our rural wedding ceremonies. As I ſhall preſently ſhow, the marriage was eſſentially and in all particulars a village-rite; but when the bridal pair ſtopped before the threſhold of the huſband's dwelling—the houſe-father as we have called him in his old world capacity—the village ceremony and the village aſpect of the rite entirely ceaſed, and the houſe ceremony began. What was

[1] Cox's "Introduction to Mythology and Folk-Lore," p. 168. See alſo Farrer's "Primitive Manners and Cuſtoms," p. 302.

[2] "Hearn's "Aryan Houſehold," p. 87.

beyond that threſhold was unknown to the primitive village, was entirely beyond its intereſt or its buſineſs; the duties of the community had ceaſed at that ſtage when the marriage, which intereſted all, had terminated its public character. We have already witneſſed the ſcene at the threſhold, and now we muſt go within and ſee how clearly the cuſtoms which follow the ceremony there are part and parcel of the ſelf-ſame worſhip and reverence for the houſe-ſpirit.

In all the principal Aryan countries, ſays Dr. Hearn, the ceremony of marriage ſeems to have conſiſted of three eſſential parts. The firſt was in ſubſtance the abandonment of, or at leaſt the agreement to abandon, his authority by the houſe-father of the bride. The ſecond was the formal delivery of the bride to the bridegroom. The third was the preſentation of the bride to the houſe ſpirits in her new home. Juſt as the Chineſe bride at the preſent day worſhips in company with her huſband his anceſtors, ſo the Aryan bride did homage to the gods of the houſe to which ſhe was introduced, and entered into formal communion with them. To this end ſhe was preſented, upon her entrance into the houſe, with the holy fire and the luſtral water, and partook, along with her huſband, in the preſence of the Lares, of the ſymbolic meal.[1]

We can ſee the germs of the houſe-cuſtom and its connection with fire elſewhere than in China among non-Aryan races. Among the Tunguſes and the Kamchadales of Siberia, attacks on women are not

[1] "The Aryan Houſehold," p. 88.

allowed to be avenged by blood, unleſs they take place within the yourt or houſe. The man is not regarded as to blame if the woman has ventured to leave her natural place, the ſacred and protecting hearth.[1] Among the Samoans whatever intercourſe may take place between the ſexes, a woman does not become a man's wife unleſs the latter takes her to his own houſe.[2] Exactly the ſame notion exiſts among the New Zealanders. The ceremony of marriage differs from a ſtate of concubinage inaſmuch as the lover ſteals to the hut of his miſtreſs, but ſhould he take her to his houſe, marriage is complete.[3] Among the Californians, the girl is eſcorted by the women to a lodge, where ſhe is ſubſequently joined by the man, conducted by his male friends. All the company bear torches, which are piled up as a fire in the lodge of the wedded pair.[4] The Ovahereró cuſtom, however, ſtands out pre-eminently clear and diſtinct. At the beginning of the marriage feſtival the bride is brought to the place of the holy fire, where ſhe muſt ſubmit herſelf to certain ceremonies, and where ſacrifice is made.[5]

The Indian ceremony is deſcribed by Mr. Kelly. The bridegroom makes oblation to fire, and the bride drops rue on it as an oblation. The bridegroom ſolemnly takes her hand in marriage. She

[1] Quoted in Lubbock's "Origin of Civilization," p. 112.
[2] Pritchard's "Polyneſian Reminiſcences," p. 134.
[3] Polack's "New Zealanders," i., p. 142.
[4] Bancroft's "Native Races of the Pacific States of North America," i., p. 350.
[5] South African "Folk-Lore Journal," vol. i., p. 49.

treads on a ſtone and mullar. They walk round the fire. This is all done at the houſe of the bride, where the bridegroom remains three days. On the fourth he conducts her to his own houſe in ſolemn proceſſion. She is then welcomed by his kindred, and the ſolemnity ends with oblations to fire.[1] Among the tribes of the Hindoo Kooſh, on the bride entering the houſe, branches of cedar are burned in an iron diſh and waved about over the bridegroom's head, and the party is ſprinkled with flour.[2] And again, after leading out the bride, the bridegroom returns and depoſits a preſent of a gun or ſword on the hearth.[3]

What we ſee here in ſavage and early Aryan ſociety is illuſtrated remarkably by ſome Scotch cuſtoms. After the ceremony at the threſhold already deſcribed, the bride was led ſtraight to the hearth, and into her hands was put the tongs, with which ſhe made up the fire. The beſom was at times ſubſtituted for the tongs, when ſhe ſwept the hearth. The *crook* was then ſwung three times round her head, in the

[1] Kelly's "Indo-European Folk-Lore," p. 293. Mr. Ralſton conſiders the Ruſſian [and Scotch] practice of walking three times round the church to be a ſurvival of this ("Academy," 15th Feb., 1879). It is intereſting to obſerve here a curious cuſtom among the Ahts of Vancouver Iſland. "When the feaſting, the ſpeeches, and the marriage ceremonies are over, the woman's friends light two torches in her late houſe, and after a time extinguiſh them in water that is ſpilt for this purpoſe on the ground" (Sproat's "Scenes and Studies of Savage Life," p. 102).

[2] Biddulph's "Tribes of the Hindoo Kooſh," pp. 78-80.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and with the prayer, "May the Almichty mack this umman a gueedwife." The laſt act of her inſtallation as "gueedwife" was leading her to the *girnal*, or *mehl-bowie*, and preſſing her hand into the meal as far as poſſible. This laſt action, it was believed, ſecured in all time coming abundance of the ſtaff of life in the houſehold.[1]

And again, when the bride is entering her future home, two of her female friends meet her at the door, the one bearing a towel or napkin, and the other a diſh filled with various kinds of bread. The towel or napkin is ſpread over her head, and the bread is then poured over her. It is gathered up by the children who have collected round the door. In former times the bride was then led up to the hearth, and, after the fire had been ſcattered, the tongs was put into her hand, and ſhe made it up.[2]

This is ſufficiently remarkable a relic of the worſhip at the houſe-fire at the inſtallation of the houſe-mother. We find in many ways that the ſacred fire was aſſociated with the marriage cuſtom. Among the Poles the bride walked three times round the fire, then ſat down and waſhed her feet.[3] In Lapland the old way of kindling fire by the ſacred flint was the only ceremony incidental to marriages,[4] and Aubrey, in his quaint and amuſing

[1] Gregor's "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," p. 93. See alſo Henderſon, *loc. cit.*, p. 36.

[2] Gregor, *loc. cit.*, p. 99.

[3] "Notes and Queries," 6th ſer., i., p. 259.

[4] Pinkerton, i., p. 165.

way, records, "I have a conceit that the Highlanders have ſomething of this cuſtom, de quo quaere,"[1] a query which I am unfortunately not able to anſwer.

Houſe-birth follows upon houſe-marriage and the inſtallation of the houſe-mother. The ſame adheſion to the worſhip of the hearth is ſhown here as in the previous ſections of the primitive houſehold. Turning once more to Dr. Hearn, we learn that "among all Aryan nations it was neceſſary that when a child was born it ſhould forthwith be preſented for acceptance to the houſe-father. It reſted with him to recognize its claims to admiſſion or to reject them. In the former caſe the new-comer was initiated into the domeſtic worſhip, in the latter it was either at once killed or expoſed. But if the leaſt morſel of food or the leaſt particle of drink had touched the child's lips, the diſcretion was at an end, and the child was held to have ſhared in the meal and ſo to be duly recognized. It is probable that the paternal recognition was followed by other ceremonies. At Athens, at leaſt, a ſpecial feſtival was held on the fifth day, it is ſaid, after the birth. There the child was carried round the ſacred hearth, and was preſented, in the ſight of all its relations, to the ſpirits of the houſe and to the houſehold. Its name was then given to it, and of this preſentation and this name the gueſts then aſſembled were witneſſes. At Rome a ſimilar ceremony was performed on the eighth or ninth day. A luſtration was celebrated and the prænomen was given."[2]

[1] "Remaines of Gentiliſme and Judaiſme," p. 150.

[2] "The Aryan Houſehold," by W. E. Hearn, p. 73.

But this is not limited to Aryan nations. A full deſcription of the ceremony attending childbirth in Madagaſcar which Mr. Ellis gives us is extremely intereſting, and I tranſcribe it in full.

In Madagaſcar, after the birth of an infant, the relatives and friends of the mother viſit her, and offer their congratulations. The infant alſo receives ſalutations, in form reſembling the following: "Saluted be the offſpring given of God! May the child live long! May the child be favoured ſo as to poſſeſs wealth!" Preſents are alſo made to the attendants in the houſehold; and ſometimes a bullock is killed on the occaſion, and diſtributed among the members of the family. Preſents of poultry, fuel, money, &c., are at times alſo ſent by friends to the mother. A piece of meat is uſually cut into thin ſlices, and ſuſpended at ſome diſtance from the floor by a cord attached to the ceiling or roof of the houſe. This is called the Kitoza, and is intended for the mother. A fire is kept in the room day and night, frequently for a week after the birth of the child.

At the expiration of that period, the infant, arrayed in the beſt clothing that can be obtained, is carried out of the houſe by ſome perſon whoſe parents are *both ſtill living*, and then taken back to the mother. In being carried out and in, the child muſt be twice carefully lifted over the fire, which is placed near the door. Should the infant be a boy, the axe, large knife, and ſpear, generally uſed in the family, muſt be taken out at the ſame time, with any implements of building that may be in the

houſe. Silver chains of native manufacture are alſo given as preſents, or uſed in theſe ceremonies, for which no particular reaſon is aſſigned.

One of the firſt acts of the father, or near relative, is to report the birth of the child to the native Sikidy, for the purpoſe of aſcertaining and declaring its deſtiny. . . . . At the expiration of the ſecond or third month from the birth of a firſt child, on a day declared to be good (lucky) by the Sikidy, a peculiar ceremony takes place, called "ſcrambling." The friends and relatives of the child aſſemble. A portion of the fat taken from the hump on the back of an ox is minced in a rice pan, cooked, and mixed up with a quantity of rice, milk, honey, and a ſort of graſs called voampamoa. A lock of the infant's hair is alſo caſt into the above *mélange* (a lock of hair is firſt cut on the left ſide of the child's head, and called *ſonia ratſy*, "the evil lock;" this muſt be thrown away, in order to avert calamity. Another lock is then cut on the right ſide; this is called *ſonia ſoa*, "the fortunate lock"), and the whole being thoroughly well mixed in the rice-pan, which is held by the youngeſt female of the family, a general ruſh is made towards the pan, and a ſcramble for its contents takes place, eſpecially by the women, as it is ſuppoſed that thoſe who are fortunate enough to obtain a portion may confidently cheriſh a hope of becoming mothers. Bananas, lemons, and ſugar-canes are alſo ſcrambled for, for a ſimilar reſult. The ceremony of ſcrambling only takes place with a firſt child. The head of the mother is decorated during the ceremonial with ſilver chains, while the

father carries the infant, if a boy, and ſome ripe bananas, on his back. The rice-pan uſed on the occaſion becomes in their eſtimation ſacred by the ſervice, and muſt not be taken out of the houſe for three ſubſequent days, otherwiſe the virtue of theſe obſervances is ſuppoſed to be loſt.[1]

It was the cuſtom with the Baſutos, immediately after the birth of a child, to kindle the fire of the houſe afreſh. For this purpoſe, it was neceſſary for a young man of chaſte habits to rub two pieces of wood together, until a flame ſprang up pure as himſelf.[2]

Among the Ovahereró, immediately after the birth of a child the mother is placed in a ſmall houſe ſpecially built for her, at the back of her own houſe. After a certain time, the mother takes her child to the place of the holy fire, to preſent it to the anceſtral deity, ſo that mother and child may be admitted again to the houſe. On this occaſion the father gives the child its name.[3] Is not this almoſt an exact reproduction of what Dr. Hearn ſays about the Aryan cuſtom?

Theſe cuſtoms tell us of the ideas aſſociated in the mind of primitive man with the birth of children to the houſe. In Aryan countries, again, the hearth worſhip takes a more diſtinctive form, although its germ is not abſent from ſavage cuſtoms. We meet with the ſurvival of the ancient cuſtom in Scotland,

[1] Ellis's "Hiſtory of Madagaſcar," i., pp. 151-3.

[2] Caſalis's "Les Baſſoutos," p. 282.

[3] South African "Folk-Lore Journal," i., p. 41; ii., pp. 63, 66.

where, according to Mr. Gregor's account, on the birth of the child, the mother and offspring were *fained*, a ceremony which was done in the following manner:—A fir-candle was lighted and carried three times round the bed, if it was in a poſition to allow of this being done, and if this could not be done, it was whirled three times round their heads; a Bible and bread and cheeſe, or a Bible and a biſcuit, were placed under the pillow, and the words were repeated, "May the Almichty debar a' ill fae this umman, an be aboot ir, an bliſs ir an ir bairn." When the biſcuit or the bread and cheeſe had ſerved their purpoſe, they were diſtributed among the unmarried friends and acquaintances, to be placed under their pillows to evoke dreams. Among ſome of the fiſhing population a fir-candle or a baſket containing bread and cheeſe was placed on the bed to keep the fairies at a diſtance.[1] The ſimilarity of this to ſome of the features of the Madagaſcar cuſtom will be at once noticed.

Dalyell records the following curious cuſtom:—"The child put on a cloth ſpread over a baſket containing proviſions was conveyed thrice round the crook of the chimney"[2]—thus preſerving the proximity of fire.

Pennant deſcribes a chriſtening feaſt in the Highlands, wherein the father placed a baſket of food acroſs the fire, and handed the infant three times over the food and flame.[3]

[1] Gregor's "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," p. 5.
[2] Dalyell's "Darker Superſtitions of Scotland," p. 176.
[3] Pennant's "Tour in Highlands," iii., p. 46.

The tranſition from the burning of fire to the burning of candles is eaſily underſtood, when the influences of civilization are taken into conſideration. This is well illuſtrated by a cuſtom mentioned by Napier, from a ballad called "The King's Daughter." A child is born, but under circumſtances which do not admit of the rite of baptiſm being adminiſtered. The mother privately puts the baby in a caſket, and ſends it afloat, and, as a protection, places beſide it a quantity of ſalt and candles.

> "The bairnie ſhe ſwyl'd in linen ſo fine,
> In a gilded caſket ſhe laid it ſyne,
> Mickle ſaut and *light* ſhe laid therein,
> Cauſe yet in God's houſe it had'na been." [1]

The Iriſh cuſtom is perhaps ſtill more ſignificant of the original connection between the primitive houſe-birth and the ſacred fire, for in Weſt Galway we meet with the curious notion that no fire muſt be removed out of a houſe in which a child is born until the mother is up and well.[2]

The mothers of Scotland are much afraid of the houſehold fairy who changes the new-born babe; and the queſtion is put to the teſt by an appeal to the houſe fire, the abode of the fairies, or, according to their primitive meaning, the anceſtral ſpirits. It is curious that theſe fairy changelings ſhould thus be connected with the old houſe fire, but it is only the folk-lore form of the primitive cuſtom.

[1] Napier's "Folk-Lore of the Weſt of Scotland," p. 34.
[2] "Folk-Lore Record," iv., p. 108.

Mr. Gregor ſays the hearth was piled with peat, and when the fire was at its ſtrength the ſuſpected changeling was placed in front of it and as near as poſſible not to be ſcorched, or it was ſuſpended in a baſket over the fire. If it was a "changeling child" it made its eſcape by the *lum*, throwing back words of ſcorn as it diſappeared.[1]

And ſo to diſcover whether it was a fairy-child, the hearth, as the home of the houſehold fairy, the primitive houſe-god, that is, was again the place of operation. A new *ſkull* was taken and hung over the fire from a piece of a branch of a hazel tree, and into this baſket the ſuſpected changeling was laid. Careful watch was kept till it ſcreamed. If it ſcreamed it was a changeling, and it was held faſt to prevent its eſcape.[2]

One other ſubject that is connected with the primitive hearth-worſhip is houſe burial. This makes the cycle of primitive houſehold life complete. Marriage, birth, and death, each connected with the hearth-god, concludes perfectly the ſyſtem of anceſtor-worſhip. Accordingly we find that there is the all-important element of ſacrifice aſſociated with burial. The hearth was the ſeat, not of the fire only, but of the ſpirit of the houſe anceſtor himſelf. In earlier times it appears that the bodies of the deceaſed anceſtors were actually buried within their dwellings.[3] That houſe burial is a *vera cauſa*, ſays

[1] "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," pp. 8-9.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[3] The aſhes of the deceaſed are uſually buried near the door of his hut at the expiration of a week after cremation,

Dr. Hearn, is proved by the fact that it is practiſed at the preſent day by many of the inferior races. It exiſts among many tribes of South America,[1] and is alſo found among the Fantees, the Dahomans, the Affins, and other tribes of Weſtern Africa.[2] Among the Fijians the graves of children are often at the beſt end of the chiefs' houſes.[3] In the ruined cities of the ancient Peruvians, the beſt preſerved mummies have been found, and when burial took place in their houſes the domeſtic implements of the Indians, cooking and water-pots of clay, and other utenſils are found. Below this ſtratum are found the gods, moſtly made of clay, but ſometimes of ſilver and gold.[4] The chief was buried in his houſe in ſome parts of New Zealand.[5] But among the Aryan nations the practice has long ſince diſappeared, and its very exiſtence has been diſputed. Dr. Hearn, however, collects together ſome paſſages from Plato, Servius, the Æneid, and other claſſical authorities, which give direct evidence that at ſome remote period our anceſtors were accuſtomed to diſpoſe in this manner of their dead.[6] But Mr. Evans, in an article contributed to "Macmillan's Magazine," does much more than refer us to claſſical

and a poſt is ſet up to mark the ſpot. Numbers of such poſts are to be ſeen in every village (Hunter's "Stat. Acc. of Aſſam," Gáros, ii., p. 155).

[1] Spencer's "Principles of Sociology," i., p. 273.

[2] Hearn's "Aryan Houſehold," p. 53.

[3] Williams's "Fiji and the Fijians," i., p. 191.

[4] "Journ. Ethnol. Soc.," i., p. 81.

[5] Taylor's "Te Ika a Maui," p. 44.

[6] "Aryan Houſehold," p. 53.

authorities. He traces out from the cuſtoms of the people of the Black Mountain diſtrict, clear and diſtinct relics of houſe burial among the Aryans,[1] and archæology, at all events in this particular, ſupplies us with the evidence that folk-lore is not capable of. Profeſſor Boyd Dawkins points out that the Neolithic tribes in Britain buried their dead ſometimes in caves which had previouſly been uſed by them for dwellings, and ſometimes in chambered tombs which probably repreſent the huts of the living.[2]

Of ſome of the accompanying rites of the old houſe burial, we find ſome peculiar relics in primitive cuſtom and Engliſh folk-lore. Among the Samoans, in all the houſes fires were kept burning night and day at the death of the chief, and hard was the fate of the man for whom no fires were kindled.[3]

On the death of a Maulai no food is cooked in the houſe for from three to eight days, according to the rank of the deceaſed, and the family ſubſiſt on food cooked elſewhere. Food is alſo placed on trees and expoſed places for birds to eat. On the evening of the appointed day a Calipha comes to the houſe, and food is cooked and offered to him. He eats a mouthful, and places a piece of bread in the mouth of the dead man's heir, after which the reſt of the family partake. The lamp is then lighted

[1] See "Macmillan's Magazine," January, 1881, p. 227.

[2] "Early Man in Britain," p. 284. Cf. Nilſſon's "Primitive Inhabitants of Scandinavia," pp. 148-168.

[3] Pritchard's "Polyneſian Reminiſcences," pp. 150-1.

(from which the ceremony is called "Chiragh roſhan"), and a ſix-ſtringed guitar, called "gherba," being produced, ſinging is kept up all the night.[1] Here we have the non-uſe of the houſe fire, but the burning of the lamp, and the offering of food. And in Scotland we meet with the ſignificant extinction of fire, and with the ſtill more ſignificant animal ſacrifice. A very ſingular belief prevails along the Borders, of which mention is made in Pennant's "Tour in Scotland:" "All fire is extinguiſhed where a corpſe is kept, and it is reckoned ſo ominous for a dog or cat to paſs over it that the poor animal is killed without mercy." Two inſtances of this ſlaughter were related to the Rev. J. F. Bigge by an old Northumbrian hind, and Mr. Henderſon duly records them in his work on the folk-lore of the northern counties. In one caſe, juſt as a funeral was about to leave the houſe, the cat jumped over the coffin, and no one would move till the cat was deſtroyed. In the other, as a funeral party were coming from a lonely houſe on a fell, carrying the coffin, becauſe they could not procure a cart, they ſet it down to reſt themſelves, and a colly dog jumped over it. It was felt by all that the dog muſt be killed, without heſitation, before they proceeded farther, and killed it was.[2]

Is not this the primitive hearth ſacrifice as repreſented in its modern folk-lore form? The ſteps of the tranſition are not very great, as the above inſtances are placed in Mr. Henderſon's book; but

[1] Biddulph's "Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh," p. 123.

[2] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore," p. 59.

add to this all that has gone before in our reſearches upon the primitive houſehold gods, and theſe ſteps appear to me to dwindle down to an almoſt level platform. How clearly fire is repreſented at death is ſhown, I think, by the wideſpread cuſtom of the uſe of torches and lights while the body is lying in the houſe, a cuſtom that is lengthily deſcribed by Brand.[1]

There are one or two other relics of the primitive houſehold and its hearth-worſhip which I muſt mention before paſſing on to another branch of our ſubject. In the uſe of fire for the cure of diſeaſe, may we not have a relic of the appeal to the houſe-ſpirit, and a ſacrifice at the hearth for the obtaining of his goodwill?[2] Mr. Hunt relates a ſtory in his "Popular Romances of the Weſt of England,"[3] which well introduces the ſubject. The child of a miner who had been ſuffering from a diſeaſe and had been ſent on ſeveral occaſions to the doctor without any good reſulting, was one day diſcovered by the father to be 'overlooked.' "The goſſips of the pariſh had for ſome time inſiſted upon the fact that the child had been ill-wiſhed, and that ſhe would never be better until 'the ſpell was taken off her.' It was then formally announced that the girl could never recover unleſs three burning ſticks were

[1] Brand's "Popular Antiquities," ii., p. 276 *et ſeq.* For the curious Chineſe parallels ſee Dennys' "Folk-Lore of China," p. 21.

[2] It is curious to note among the Pimas (New Mexicans), if a man has killed an Apache he muſt not look on a blazing fire during ſixteen days (Bancroft's "Native Races," i., p. 553).

[3] "Popular Romances of the Weſt of England," p. 212.

taken from the hearth of the 'overlooker,' and the child was made to walk three times over them when they were laid acroſs on the ground, and then quench the fire with water." How this was carried out all readers of Mr. Hunt's book will know.

Without going into the wide and intereſting ſubject of folk-medicine, we meet with one or two remarkable parallels of the cure of diſeaſe at the houſe fire. I will quote a caſe from ſavage cuſtom and then turn to Engliſh folk-lore. In Hawaii they believe that the ſorcerers can by certain incantations diſcover the author or cauſe of the diſeaſe. The moſt general ceremony is the Kuniahi, broiling fire. When a chief wiſhes to reſort to it, he ſends for a prieſt, who, on his arrival, receives a number of hogs, dogs, and fowls together with ſeveral bundles of tapa. He then kindles a ſmall fire near the couch of the invalid and covers it with ſtones. This being done, he kills one of the dogs by ſtrangling it, and cuts off the head of one of the fowls, muttering all the while his prayers to the god he invokes. The dog, fowl, and pig, if there be one, are then cut open, embowelled, and laid on the heated ſtones, the prieſt continuing his incantations and watching, at the ſame time the offerings broiling on the fire. A ſmall part only of theſe offerings are eaten by the prieſt, the reſt remain on the fire until conſumed, when the prieſt lies down to ſleep; and if his prayers are anſwered, he informs the poor ſufferer on awaking who or what is the cauſe of his ſickneſs.[1] This cuſtom, even in its ſavage outline, repreſents

[1] Ellis's "Miſſionary Tour through Hawaii," p. 259.

ſomething in the chain of events which connect the houſe fire with the ſacred hearth devoted to anceſtor worſhip. But a fuller account of a cuſtom among the South African Ovahereró tribe leaves no doubt upon the ſubject. When a chief is ill, a pot containing meat killed for the purpoſe is cooking on the okuruo (ſacred) fire. As the pot boils the ſick man is carried round and round by his friends, who chant ſomething like the following ſupplication to the Omukuru (anceſtral deity).

> "See, Father, we have come here,
> With this ſick man to you,
> That he may ſoon recover."[1]

Of courſe we do not get in Engliſh folk-lore exact parallels to theſe weird cuſtoms, but they are ſo nearly exact as to make an extraordinary addition to our ſtock of evidence. Henderſon records ſome ſingular inſtances of charming diſeaſe. In one of theſe, for example, the object was to reſtore to health a young man ſaid to be bewitched. A fire was made by midnight, and the doors and windows cloſed. Clippings from every finger and toe-nail of the patient, with hair from each temple and the crown of his head, were ſtuffed into the throat of a pigeon which had previouſly been placed between the patient's feet, and there had died at once, thus atteſting the witchery from which he was ſuffering. The bird's bill was riveted with three pins, and then the wiſe man thruſt a pin into its breaſt, to reach the heart, everybody elſe in the room in turn

[1] South African "Folk-Lore Journal," i., p. 51.

following his example. An opening was then made in the fire, and the pigeon dropped into it. The wife man began to read aloud Pſalms from the prayer-book, and a loud ſcratching and whining began outſide. All in the houſe were ſatisfied that the young man's enemy had appeared outſide, perhaps in the form of a dog.[1]

During the preſent year (1882) the daily papers record an extraordinary caſe of ſuperſtition which agrees very cloſely with the interpretation I am ſeeking for this group of folk-lore. At Wells, in Somerſet, the wife of a working man became mentally affected, and was removed to a lunatic aſylum. Immediately before her departure it was ſtated that ſhe was bewitched, and the following mode of removing the ſpells was preſented to the huſband. Firſt he muſt ſtick a large number of pins in an animal's heart, which in the dead of night was to be roaſted before a quick fire, the revolutions of the heart to be as regular as poſſible. After roaſting, the heart was to be placed in the chimney and left there, the belief being that, as the heart rotted away, ſo would the heart of the witch rot, and the bewitched would be releaſed from the power of her enemy.[2]

A Scotch cuſtom ſhows that the virtue of the fire for healing diſeaſe lay in its being new, virgin fire. This virgin fire takes us back to ſome cuſtoms already noted in connection with the ſacred fire on the hearth. A notice having been given to all the

[1] Henderſon, *loc. cit.*, p. 220.

[2] "Folk-Lore Record," v., p. 172.

houſeholders within the boundaries of two ſtreams to extinguiſh all lights and fires on a given morning, the ſufferer and his friends cauſe an emiſſion of new fire by a ſpinning-wheel or other means of friction, and having ſpread it from ſome tow to a candle, thence to a torch, and from the torch to a peatload, ſend it by meſſengers to the expectant houſes.[1] This appears to me to repreſent an appeal to the old ſacred fire of the hearth; and when we conſider the curious nature of the other cuſtoms mentioned under this diviſion of our ſubject, and connect them with what has been proved of other branches of ancient home life, there does not appear to me to be much doubt that we have here another important phaſe of primitive belief in the ſacred hearth as the ſeat of the health-giving divinities—the gods of the houſehold.

We have now gone through the various items of Engliſh folk-lore which, when compared with the exiſting cuſtoms of ſavage ſociety or of early Aryan ſociety, take us back to the old houſehold ſpirits of our anceſtors. How complete is the ſurvival of this group of ancient beliefs, is only to be ſeen now that we have placed modern cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions in the right relationſhip one with another, and ſide by ſide with primitive belief. Step by ſtep we have placed in archaic ſequence cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions which mean nothing in their iſolated poſition in modern folk-lore, but which mean in their new place that they form part of a ſyſtem

[1] Stewart's "Popular Superſtitions of the Highlanders," p. 149.

which commences farther back than hearth-religion, and goes ſtill farther forward into early village life.

Dr. Hearn ſums up the ſubſtance of theſe primitive houſehold rites as follows:—

"The primitive religion was domeſtic. This domeſtic religion was compoſed of two cloſely related parts; the worſhip of deceaſed anceſtors, and the worſhip of the hearth. The latter form was ſubſidiary to, and conſequent upon the former. The deceaſed anceſtor, or his aſhes, was either actually buried, or aſſumed to be buried beneath the hearth. Here therefore, according to the primitive belief, his ſpirit was ſuppoſed to dwell; and here it received thoſe daily offerings which were its rightful dues, and were eſſential to its happineſs. The fire which burned on the hearth rendered theſe offerings fit for the finer organs of the ſpirit world, and tranſmitted them to him for whom they were deſigned. Thus the worſhip of the Lares was the foundation and the ſupport of the adoration of the hearth, which was in effect its altar, and of the holy fire which for ever burned there."[1]

In grouping together many cuſtoms which are the property of the few and the ignorant in our own country, and comparing them with the cuſtoms of ſavage tribes, we have done much towards underſtanding the factors which underlie primitive life. Comparative folk-lore thus claims as a part of its poſſeſſions many of the iſolated and ſingular cuſtoms of the peaſantry of civilization; and from this platform we can look back beyond the ages which

[1] "The Aryan Houſehold," p. 54.

political progreſs has placed between civilization and barbariſm and ſee how it was that our anceſtors lived, and what they had in place of our ſtate machinery and national government. The houſehold was one in itſelf. It was protected by the tribal or village gods, and in return it protected with ſacred excluſiveneſs and under the ſacred influences of its own ſpecial ſpirit all the members of the family under its roof. From this point of view, to adopt the words of Sir George Cox, "the influence of the houſe-god was more deeply felt and brought more good than that of any other deity. Her worſhip involved direct and practical duties. She could not be fully ſerved by men who broke their plighted word or dealt treacherouſly with thoſe whom they had received at their hearths; and thus her worſhip was almoſt an unmixed good, both for houſeholds and the ſtate."[1]

[1] "Introduction to Mythology and Folk-Lore," p. 168.

CHAPTER VI.

THE HOUSE GODS AS GODS OF AGRICULTURE.

WE have now ſeen how in the minds of early mankind the houſe was protected by the ſpirit-world. That the ſelf-ſame fancies which exiſt among ſavage men exiſted among our own anceſtors is alſo ſhown by the fact that we find them ſtill extant in folk-lore, which, as before ſtated, conſiſts of ſurvivals of ancient thought and cuſtom among certain ſections of the community who have not embraced all the teachings of political civilization. But there is a queſtion to be aſked at this ſtage which takes us to another branch of comparative folk-lore.

Did theſe fancies exiſt in the minds of our Aryan anceſtors in the ſame way, and with the ſame undefined object as they exiſt in ſavage races? It is no uſe entering upon the ſtudy of comparative folk-lore unleſs we not only compare, but endeavour to fix upon the archaic ſignificance of the various cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions brought into notice. It

is no uſe comparing the foundation ſacrifices of ſavage races and of early Britain, the houſe gods of ſavage races and of early Britain, unleſs we can work out from this compariſon ſome evidence as to wherein lay the difference in the two races, that compelled the one to ſtand ſtill or progreſs only within narrow limits, and the other to puſh forward and ultimately build up ſuch a civilization as the world now poſſeſſes. That difference will be found to reſt upon the exiſtence of a definite and progreſſive village life in the early Aryan, as compared with an indefinite, ſhifting, ſocial grouping of the ſavage. From what we have ſeen in the previous pages there can be no doubt that the early Aryan retained all, or almoſt all, the faiths and ſuperſtitions of his earlier ſocial ſtage, but he welded them into a definite and homogeneous ſyſtem, he wove them into the daily life that ſurrounded him, put them to new uſes, and made them ſerve him inſtead of maſter him.

I think I can ſee my way to theſe concluſions ariſing from the facts of comparative folk-lore, as they have been conſidered in relation to early home life; and when we come to note how the houſe-religion, ſo excluſive and ſacred as it has been proved to be, has gradually penetrated into the realms of nature-worſhip ſo prevalent among early man, and abſorbed into its ritual and its beliefs old fancies and ſuperſtitions which cling round the objects of nature, we ſhall be able to comprehend more clearly the forces which have built up the home life of our anceſtors. We have aſcertained thus far what the houſe-

worſhip was and what were its chief influences, but by proceeding yet further in our ſtudies I think it will be ſeen that the Aryan houſe-worſhip was a much ſtronger belief than its ſavage original, becauſe it incorporated much of the religion which in ſavage life was directed elſewhere. Mr. Morgan ſays, "the firſt aſcertained appearance of the Aryan family was in connection with the domeſtic animals, at which time they were one people in language and nationality."[1] But how many important ſurroundings are included in this domeſtication of animals!—ſufficient to tell us of a family life which has laid the foundation of empires.

It has already been pointed out that the foundation ſacrifice—the firſt ceremony that gives us any idea of the ſacred characteriſtics of the primitive houſehold—was a ſacrifice to the ſpirit of the locality. Earth, water, foreſts, and hills are all the abodes of deities in the fancies of early mankind; and the folk-lore literature of this ſubject would embrace an extenſive reſearch.[2] Stepping on to the borderland of this ſubject, let us note an example or two which will explain ſomewhat the nature of the ſacrifice at the foundation of the houſe. "The Aka fears the high mountains which tower aloft over his dwelling; he fears the roaring torrents of the deep glen, which interpoſes between him and his friends beyond; and he fears the dark and denſe jungle in which his

[1] "Ancient Society," p. 39.

[2] See Tylor's "Anthropology," cap xiv., and Mr. Ralſton's article "Foreſt and Field Myths," in the "Contemporary Review," 1878, xxxi., pp. 520-37.

cattle loſe their way. Theſe dark and threatening powers of nature he inveſts with ſupernatural attributes; they are his gods, and he names them Fúxo, the god of jungle and water; Firan and Siman, the gods of war; and Satu, the god of houſe and field. Offerings are made to the gods at the different cultivating ſeaſons, and alſo in token of gratitude when a child is born." [1]

This repreſents the general characteriſtics of nature-worſhip exiſting in more or leſs degree all over the world. Turning to a ſpecial phaſe of it incidental to our preſent object, we find among the Baſutos that, upon the ſite of the village being choſen, the chief drives into the ground a peg covered with charms, in order that the village may be firmly nailed to the ſoil.[2] When the North American Indians went to a new land, they would build a fire, and burn upon it ſome fiſh, good mats, or ſomething made with the hand, except clothes, in order to gain the good will of the god of the land.[3] Among the Karok tribes of North America there is a great dance of propitiation, at which all the tribes are preſent. They call it by a term which ſignifies literally "working the earth." The object of it is to propitiate the ſpirits of the earth and the foreſt, in order to prevent diſaſtrous land ſlides, foreſt fires, earthquakes, drought, and other calamities, and among the many ceremonies connected

[1] Hunter's "Statiſtical Account of Aſſam," i., p. 356; quoting Dalton's "Ethnology of Bengal."

[2] Caſalis's "Les Baſſoutos," p. 130.

[3] "The American Antiquarian Journal," ii., p. 14.

with it is the kindling by flint and ſteel of the ſacred fire.[1]

Again, from New Zealand we have a curious piece of evidence. The Hawaiki fleet reached New Zealand in the ſummer. To appeaſe the ſpirit of the land for their intruſion humiliating prayers were ſaid; one uttered by a chief on this celebrated occaſion is ſtill preſerved as a modern charm :—

> "I arrive when an unknown earth is under my feet,
> I arrive when a new ſky is above me,
> I arrive at this land,
> A reſting-place for me.
> O ſpirit of the earth! the ſtranger humbly offers his heart as food for thee."[2]

This worſhip of land deities is ſhown to have ſurvived among the early races of Britain by ſome curious pieces of evidence. Does not ſuch a picture as the following tell us diſtinctly of this old-world faith, almoſt as if it were written by the modern chronicler of the Aka Indians, rather than by an Engliſh Chriſtian?

The fens and wilds (ſays Mr. Wright[3]) are in Beowulf conſtantly peopled by troops of elves and nicers and worms (dragons and ſerpents). So in the ſaints legends are they ever the haunts of hobgoblins (dæmones); and many and fierce were the ſtruggles between them and the hermits, before the latter ſucceeded in eſtabliſhing themſelves in their

[1] "American Ethnology," iii., pp. 28-30.
[2] Thomſon's "Story of New Zealand," i., p. 61.
[3] "Eſſays on the Middle Ages," i., pp. 263-4.

deſerted abodes. St. Guthlac built him a mud-cot in the Iſle of Croyland, a wild ſpot, then covered with woods and pools and ſedgy marſhes. The iſle had hitherto been uninhabited by man; but many a goblin played among its ſolitudes, and very unwilling were they to be driven out. They came upon him in a body, dragged him from his cell, ſometimes toſſed him in the air, at others dipped him over head in the bogs, and then tore him through the midſt of the brambles; but their efforts were vain againſt one who was armed like Guthlac, for he carried to the combat "ſcutum fidei, loricam ſpei, galeam caſtitatis, arcum pœnitentiæ, ſagittas pſalmodiæ." St. Botulf choſe for his reſidence Ykanho, a place not leſs wild and ſolitary than Croyland itſelf, which had hitherto, his hiſtorian tells us, been only the ſcene of the fantaſtic "illuſion" (faery, we might ſay) of the goblins now to be baniſhed by the intruſion of the holy recluſe. At his firſt appearance they attempted to ſcare him with horrid noiſes; but finding him proof againſt their attacks (for he was not worſe armed than Guthlac), they endeavoured to move him by perſuaſive expoſtulations. "A long time," they ſaid, "we have poſſeſſed this ſpot, and we had hoped to dwell in it for ever. Why, cruel Botulf, doſt thou forcibly drive us from our haunts? Thee or thine we have neither injured nor diſturbed. What ſeekeſt thou by diſlodging us? and what wilt thou gain by our expulſion? When we are already driven from every other corner of the world, thou wilt not let us ſtay quietly even in this ſolitude." Botulf made

the ſign of the croſs, and the elves and nicers departed.

It is curious to obſerve that theſe land deities thus exiſting in popular tradition are preſerved to us by other records. Camden ſays that, among the Celtic population of Ireland, "when anyone gets a fall, he ſprings up, and turning about three times to the right, digs a hole in the ground with his knife or ſword, and cuts out a turf, for they imagine there is a ſpirit in the earth."[1]

The prefect of a Gauliſh cohort, who erected an altar on the limits of Caledonia, has ſummed up in ſmall compaſs the whole inviſible heathen world of the country. This altar is dedicated "to the field deities and deities of Britain." It was found at Caſtle Hill, on the wall of Antoninus, and is deſcribed in Stewart's "Caledonia Romana."[2] Theſe field deities and land deities of Britain were, of courſe, the repreſentatives of Dēmētēr, Terra mater ("mother earth," as the popular ſaying ſtill gives it in our own land), and all the rural deities of Greece and Rome, the hiſtory of the belief in which forms one of the moſt intereſting chapters of ancient mythology.

In theſe old earth-goddeſſes of Greece and Rome, and of other Aryan lands, we have the tribal or ethnological expreſſion of belief in this one phaſe of nature-worſhip. It has become varied and ſymbolized during its progreſs from the ſavage originals

[1] Camden's "Britannia," ed. by Gibſon, ii., p. 378; quoted by Forbes Leſlie, "Early Races of Scotland," i., p. 151.

[2] Forbes Leſlie's "Early Races of Scotland," i., p. 153.

to the forms in which it appears in the advanced Aryan thought as ſhown in claſſical literature, and it has become degraded by the time it appears in Engliſh traditional lore. But this does not repreſent the whole of the proceſs that has been going on. One part of the belief in the old land deities has become attached to the houſe-religion, has been abſorbed into the houſe-religion. Turning to ſome agricultural rites and ceremonies exiſting in England and among ſome hill tribes of India, we ſhall find that underlying the long-enduring belief in land deities, there is yet a deeper and more enduring belief ſtill, a belief engendered by the fact that the god who provides the plenty, who clothes and feeds, was worſhipped at the ſame altar, and with the ſame offerings, and the ſame ritual, as the anceſtral deity was worſhipped at the ſacred houſe-fire, and who thus became identified with the houſehold deity.

This gradual encroachment of the houſe-religion upon the old nature-beliefs of early man can be ſhown by the curiouſly progreſſive examples to be gained from comparative folk-lore. The earlieſt fancies of the Aryan mind clearly connect the agricultural deity with the earth deity.

> "When the corn grows, then the demons hiſs;
> When the ſhoots ſprout, then the demons cough;
> When the ſtalks riſe, then the demons weep;
> When the thick ears come, then the demons fly."

ſays an old Aryan hymn quoted by Mr. Tylor,[1] and repreſenting, as it does, the demons to be antagoniſtic to the produce of corn, it is the counter-

[1] "Anthropology," p. 382.

part of many ſavage cuſtoms, as among the New Zealanders, who offered the firſt fruits to the atua of evil.[1]

The Khands have many deities, race-gods, tribe-gods, family-gods, and a multitude of malignant ſpirits and demons. But their great divinity is the earth-god, who repreſents the productive energy of nature. Twice each year, at ſowing time and at harveſt, and in all ſeaſons of ſpecial calamity, the earth-god required a human ſacrifice. The duty of providing the victims reſted with the lower race attached to the Khand village. Brahmins and Khands were the only claſſes exempted from ſacrifice, and an ancient rule ordained that the offering muſt be bought with a price. Men of the lower race kidnapped the victims from the plains, and a thriving Khand village uſually kept a ſmall ſtock in reſerve "to meet ſudden demands for atonement." The victim, on being brought to the hamlet, was welcomed at every threſhold, daintily fed, and kindly treated till the fatal day arrived. He was then ſolemnly ſacrificed to the earth-god, with Khands ſhouting in his dying ear, "We bought you with a price; no ſin reſts with us!" His fleſh and blood were diſtributed among the village lands.[2]

I think we have here a good type of the tranſitional ſtage of worſhip from the earth-god to the

[1] Polack's "Manners and Cuſtoms of the New Zealanders," ii., p. 176.

[2] Hunter's "Imperial Gazetteer of India;" cf. Tylor's "Anthropology," p. 365.

houſe-god; for this ſacrifice which was made to the earth-god was yet ſanctified at every threſhold of the village. So, too, the foundation ſacrifice made, in its oldeſt and ſavage form, to the earth-deity, was made, in its later and Aryan form, to the houſe-deity. It is at ſuch a ſtage as this that I conceive the point of departure to have been, that I think the advancing Aryan began transferring his worſhip from nature-gods to houſe-gods; began cluſtering his old faiths and beliefs, rites and ceremonies, ſuperſtitions and fancies around the home in the village.

A very curious contribution to this tranſitional phaſe of agricultural folk-lore is contained in the comparative hiſtory of the Chriſtmas yule-log feſtival.

We all know the deſcription of this given by Brand, Henderſon, and other writers on Engliſh folk-lore. The hauling home of the log, and the lighting of it from the remnants of the laſt Chriſtmas log, the prohibition againſt giving out fire on Chriſtmas day, are the folk-lore repreſentations of the ever-burning houſe-fire, which was rekindled once a year from the ever-burning village fire. But how nearly this modern folk-lore correſponds to the ritual of early houſe-religion, is beſt ſeen by a compariſon with the yule-log cuſtom of the Black Mountain people, and a cuſtom appertaining to anceſtor worſhip among a South African people. The yule-log of Chriſtmas is here taken quite out of the category of Chriſtmas cuſtoms, and unmiſtakably linked on to the religious ceremonies of primi-

tive anceſtor worſhip. Mr. Arthur J. Evans thus deſcribes the Black Mountain cuſtom in ſome very inſtructive papers which appeared in "Macmillan's Magazine," for January, 1881:—

The log duly felled, the houſe-father utters a prayer, and placing it on his ſhoulders, bears it home to his yard, and leans it againſt the outer wall of the houſe, with the freſhly-cut end uppermoſt—a point about which they are moſt rigorous. Other leſſer logs, repreſenting the different male members of the family, are now brought out and leant beſide the *glavni badnjak;* and the houſe-father as he ſet each log in ſucceſſion againſt the houſe-wall, had repeated the formula, *veſeli badnji dan!* "A merry log day!"

Let us now turn to another and far diſtant land. A cuſtom of the Ovahereró tribe of South Africa in approaching their anceſtors or deities is moſt curiouſly parallel. A dead chieftain had been buried in his houſe, which had conſequently been deſerted. But his relations, upon viſiting the ſhrine, approached it as the abode of the anceſtral deities. A fire "is made upon the old place of holy fire, and a ſheep ſlaughtered near it, of which perſons of both ſexes and all ages are allowed to eat."[1] Is not this the ſavage original of the Chriſtmas feaſt? In the Black Mountains Mr. Evans tells us that—

"The houſe-elder looks out ſome animal—a pig,

[1] South African "Folk-Lore Journal," i., p. 62. Compare the Madagaſcar legend, told by Mr. Sibree, of the meeting of the cattle at the burial-place of the chief, and the ſelf-ſacrifice of the fatteſt of them ("Folk-Lore Record," iv., p. 46).

ſheep, goat, or fowl—to be fed up for the Chriſtmas feaſt, during the whole time that the feaſt laſts. Rich and poor alike do this; even the pooreſt families buying a chicken, if they have no ſtock of their own, as it would be a terrible misfortune not to be able, as they ſay, 'to make the knife bloody for Chriſtmas.' On 'Tuchni dan,' or ſlaughter day, the third day before Chriſtmas, the animal thus ſet apart is ſlaughtered by having its throat cut, is cleaned, and hung for Chriſtmas morning."

And in Engliſh folk-lore this is repreſented by the Manx cuſtom, which is, that on the 24th of December all the ſervants have a holiday, and after twelve o'clock at night they hunt the wren, kill it, and bury it with great formality.[1] Or applying the archæological law of the transference from one ſeaſon to another of cuſtoms which once belonged to primitive ſociety, the Iriſh idea that ſome animal muſt be killed on St. Martin's day, becauſe "blood muſt be ſhed,"[2] is the exact counterpart of the Black Mountain Chriſtmas cuſtom, and the folk-lore ſurvival in civilized ſociety. So far, then, the Black Mountain Chriſtmas ſacrifice and its parallel in Engliſh folk-lore are types of a primitive Aryan cuſtom. But the parallel runs much farther back into early ſociety than this. The yule-log cuſtom of the Black Mountain people is parallel to a log cuſtom of the Ovahereró in the worſhip of their anceſtors. After the ſlaughter of the ſheep, as noticed above, every ſon of the buried chief ap-

[1] Brand's "Popular Antiquities," i., p. 472.

[2] "Folk-Lore Record," iv., p. 107.

proaches the place of holy fire with a branch or a ſmall tree. Theſe they ſet up in a row on the ſouth-weſt ſide of the building, and an ox is ſlaughtered for each of the ſons.[1] Can we help recognizing in this the parallel ſavage cuſtom to that of the Black Mountain people? The South African cuſtom definitely and diſtinctly appertains to the worſhip of anceſtors, the Black Mountain Chriſtmas cuſtom abſorbs ſo many features of this cult as known to Aryan ſociety, that Mr. Evans rightly places his papers on the ſubject as a freſh chapter of its hiſtory.

Our next taſk is to ſee how all this ſurvival of the primitive houſe-religion is connected with early agricultural rites. I cannot help connecting the Black Mountain log feſtival with the agricultural feſtival. As the logs are brought into the houſe, the houſe-mother ſprinkles ſome corn, and utters a wiſh or prayer, a cuſtom ſignificant enough. And this very nearly affimilates with a cuſtom among the wild tribes of India. At the gathering of the harveſt, the Lhooſai, or Kookies, have a feſtival called among them "Chukchai." The chief goes ſolemnly with his people to the foreſt, and cuts down a large tree, which is afterwards carried into the village, and ſet up in the midſt. Sacrifice is then offered, and "khong," ſpirits, and rice are poured over the tree. A feaſt and dance cloſe the ceremony.[2] We do not here get the burning of the log at the houſe fire; but this, it appears to

[1] South African "Folk-Lore Journal," i., p. 62.

[2] Lewin's "Wild Races of S. E. India," p. 270.

me, is the addition which Aryan ſociety made to the primitive harveſt feſtival.

We will now endeavour to ſhow how other branches of the old houſe-religion are connected with agricultural duties. We have ſeen that anceſtor worſhip is the worſhip at the hearth. So, too, is anceſtor worſhip connected with the agricultural feſtival. What elſe can be the explanation of the old ploughing cuſtom of telling the yoke-horſes or cattle of the death of their owner ?[1]—a cuſtom that was in full vogue in Herefordſhire a few years ago. A no doubt ſubſtituted or debaſed variant of this, namely, telling of the death of the owner to the bees, has a large range of folk-lore literature, but the true parallel is ſeen in the following cuſtom among the Naga hill tribes of India. On the occurrence of a death, they howl their lamentations, feaſt, and bury the corpſe, placing the deceaſed's ſpear in the grave, and his ſhield, and a few ſmall ſticks, like forks, with ſome eggs and grain, on the grave, as an offering to inſure them good crops.[2]

Another cuſtom incidental to the primitive houſe-worſhip, as noticed in the preceding chapter, was the ceremony attending the birth of children. We have ſeen that it took place at the ſacred hearth of the houſehold. But before the houſe-religion had fully abſorbed it, and made it a part of itſelf, there were phaſes of tranſition from its firſt form in nature-worſhip. One example of theſe tranſitional phaſes

[1] See "Bye-gones relating to Wales," Feb. 1882, p. 9.

[2] "Journ. As. Soc. Bengal," xii., p. 952.

we meet with among the wild tribes of India, and I cannot do better than quote Mr. Lewin's account of the cuſtom, for it will need no comment or explanation. At a Chukma village, Mr. Lewin was once preſent when ſacrifice was offered to the "nats," or deities of the wood and ſtream, by the head man, on the occaſion of the recovery of the man's wife from childbirth. The offering was a ſucking pig and a fowl. The altar was of bamboo, decorated with young plantain ſhoots and leaves. On this raiſed platform were placed ſmall cups containing rice, vegetables, and a ſpirit diſtilled from rice. Round the whole, from the houſe-mother's diſtaff, had been ſpun a long white thread, which encircled the altar, and then, carried into the houſe, was held at its two ends by the good man's wife. The ſacrifice commenced by a long invocation uttered by the huſband, who ſtood oppoſite to his altar, and beneath each ſnatch of his charm he tapped the ſmall platform with his hill-knife, and uttered a long, wailing cry; this was for the purpoſe of attracting the numerous wandering ſpirits who go up and down upon the earth, and calling them to the feaſt. When a ſufficient number of theſe inviſible gueſts was believed to be aſſembled, he cut the throats of the victims, and poured a libation of blood upon the altar and over the thread.[1]

In the curious volume of "Anglo-Saxon Leechdoms"[2] we have, perhaps, one of the moſt extraordinary records of agricultural folk-lore, in its

[1] Lewin's "Wild Races of S. E. India," p. 173.

[2] Vol. i., pp. 399-405. Cf. Thorpe's "Analecta," p. 117,

connection with the old houſe-religion that Engliſh literature contains. We learn that the way to reſtore fertility to land rendered ſterile by witchcraft or ſorcery was as follows: "Here is the remedy, how thou mayſt amend thine acres, if they will not wax well, or if therein anything improper have been done by ſorcery or witchcraft. Take then at night, ere it dawn, four turfs on the four quarters of the land, and mark how they formerly ſtood. Then take oil and honey, and barm, and milk of every cattle which is on the land, and part of every kind of tree which is grown on the land, except hard beans, and part of every wort known by name, except buckbean (?) [burr]; and add to them holy water, then ſprinkle thrice the place where the turf grew, repeating theſe words thrice, 'Creſcite (*i.e.* increaſe), multiplicamini (*i.e.* multiply) et replete terram (*i.e.* and repleniſh the earth), in nomine Patris,' &c. Say Paternoſter an equal number of times; then carry the turfs to the church, and let the maſs-prieſt ſing four maſſes over them, and let the green ſide be turned towards the altar. And then carry the turfs before ſunſet to the place they came from; and have ready made of juniper tree four crucifixes, and write on each end, 'Mattheus, Marcus, Lucas, and Johannes.' Lay the crucifix down in the hole, and ſay, 'Crux, Mattheus; crux, Marcus; crux, Lucas; crux, Johannes!' Then take the turf, and place it thereon, repeating nine times the word 'Creſcite' and Paternoſter. Then

and Metcalfe's "Engliſhman and Scandinavian," p. 103. I have uſed the latter verſion as far as poſſible.

turn to the eaſt, and make an obeiſance nine times, and ſay theſe words—

"'Eaſtward I ſtand,
Mercies I beg:
I beg the great God,
The mighty Lord,
I beg the holy
Guard of heaven;
I beg earth
And high heaven,
And the true
Sancta Maria,
And the lofty manſion,
That I may this enchantment,
By the favour of the Lord,
Utter with my teeth,
With firm mind
Awaken the fruits
Unto us for worldly uſe,
May fill the earth
With firm belief,'" &c.

After thrice turning to the eaſt, a proſtration on the earth, ſundry litanies and ſanctuſes, a benedicite pronounced with arms outſtretched, &c., the chief perſonage in this ceremonial takes ſome unknown ſeed from almſmen, gathers all the ploughing inſtruments together, places on the beam incenſe, fennel, conſecrated ſoap, and conſecrated ſalt; then he is to take the ſeed, ſet it on the plough, and ſay—

"Arch, arch, arch!
Mother of earth
Grant to thee, the omnipotent,
Eternal Lord,
Fields growing

And flouriſhing,
Fructifying
And ſtrengthening,
The rural crops
And the broad
Crops of barley
And the white
Wheaten crops,
And all the
Crops of earth,
Grant the owner,
God Almighty,
And his hallows
In heaven who are
That his farm be fortified
Gainſt all fiends, gainſt each one,
And may it be embattled round
Gainſt baleful blaſtings every one
With ſorceries may
Through a land ſow.
Now I pray the wielder of all,
Him, who made this world of yore,
That there be none ſo cunning wife,
That there be none ſo crafty man,
Who ſhall render weak and null
Words ſo deftly neatly ſaid."

Then let one drive forward the plough, and cut the firſt furrow; then ſay—

"Hail to thee, mother earth,
Mortals maintaining,
Be growing and fertile
By the goodness of God,
Filled with fodder
Our folk to feed."

Then take meal of every kind, and let one bake a broad loaf as big as will lie within his two hands,

and knead it with milk and with holy water, and lay it under the firſt furrow. Then ſay—

"Land filled with fodder
Mankind to feed,
Brightly blooming,
Bleſſed become thou
For the holy name
Of him who heaven created,
And this earth
On which we live,
May the God who made theſe grounds
Grant to us his growing grace,
That to us of corn each kind
May come to good."

Then ſay thrice "Creſcite," &c., and the Paternoſter thrice.

Nothing could be more ſingularly ſignificant of an old village rite than this extraordinary ſurvival of pagan fancies amidſt Chriſtian worſhip. It ſo happens that the whole formula has been preſerved in theſe Anglo-Saxon writings, and that hence we can ſtudy it in its completeneſs, and not when it is broken up—as other old village rites are broken up—into the countleſs fragments which modern folk-lore preſents to the ſtudent. It is juſt one of thoſe examples of ſurvival which ſupply the argument for a piecing together of the rites and ceremonies we are now conſidering into a connected whole, and ſaying that we have produced therefrom ſomething like a picture of early village life. And if we turn to the traditional ſurvival of this ancient cuſtom, the manner in which folk-lore is ſplit up and ſeparated into detached fragments is very

curiouſly demonſtrated. Having the cuſtom as it was practiſed among our Anglo-Saxon anceſtors, the following appear to be the forms of it, as it has come down by traditional obſervance. At the Yule-tide feſtival in Banffshire and Aberdeenſhire, ſays Mr. Gregor,[1] a little water along with a handful of graſs, or a ſmall quantity of moſs, was carried into the houſe, and placed on the hearth. The next example is even a nearer parallel to the original. The "Warrington Guardian" newſpaper of 26th November, 1881, records that a woman aſked the Vicar of Lower Gornal, in Staffordſhire, to cut a turf four inches ſquare from a grave in which lay a man who could not lie at eaſe becauſe of a guilty conſcience, and ſtated that the putting of the turf on the communion table would cauſe all the ghoſts to diſappear. And, finally, Mr. Gregor ſays that "when the plough was 'ſtrykit,' *i.e.*, put into the ground for the firſt time in autumn or ſpring, to prepare the ſoil for the ſeed, bread and cheeſe, with ale or whiſky, was carried to the field, and partaken of by the houſehold. A piece of bread with cheeſe was put into the plough, and another piece was caſt into the field 'to feed the craws.'"[2] Here, then, are three fragments of one original cuſtom once more reſtored to their rightful place in Engliſh folk-lore. Let us ſee how it is repreſented in other lands. Among the agricultural cuſtoms of the Ambala diſtrict in Lahore, the Zamíndárs go to their fields

[1] "Antiquary," vol. v. p. 5; cf. Gregor's "Folk-Lore of N. E. of Scotland," p. 160.

[2] "Folk-Lore of N.E. of Scotland," p. 181.

with ſeven leaves of the akh (*Aſclepias gigantea*), which they place on the harrow, and on the leaves ſome parched rice and ſugar, and burn incenſe.[1] Theſe two latter cuſtoms are very nearly identical, and they connect the field ſacrifice with the houſehold ſacrifice. But, again, when the crops are ripe, and ready for the ſickle, the people of this diſtrict of India firſt cut and bring home a load of every kind of grain, and offer it to the houſehold gods.[2]

Of courſe, the form of the cuſtom as given in the ſuperſtition at Warrington, and in the old Anglo-Saxon record, is not ſo archaic as the Yule-tide feſtival of Scotland. In the firſt we ſee the Church taking the place of the primitive houſe, and the altar that of the ſacred hearth; but this appears to be the transference of deep-rooted cuſtom from paganiſm to Chriſtianity, which has not taken place in the purer Scotch cuſtom.

The cuſtoms of the agricultural diſtricts of England and Scotland ſingularly bring out their connection with an ancient houſe-religion. "Our moſt characteriſtic feſtive rejoicings," ſays Mr. Henderſon, "accompany the harveſt—the mell-ſupper and the kern-baby, uſages which are by no means extinct among us." In ſome parts the feſtival takes place at the end of the reaping, not of the ingathering. "When the ſickle is laid down, and the laſt ſheaf of golden corn ſet on end, it is ſaid that they have 'got the kern.' The reapers announce

[1] "The Roman-Urdú Journal," Lahore, vol. iii. (1880), p. 11.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

the fact by loud ſhouting, and an image is at once hoiſted on a pole, and given into the charge of the talleſt and ſtrongeſt man of the party. The image is crowned with wheat-ears, and dreſſed up in gay finery, a white frock and coloured ribbons being its conventional attire. The whole group circle round this harveſt-queen, or kern-baby, curtſeying to her, and dancing and ſinging; and thus they proceed to the farmer's barn, where they ſet the image up on high, as the preſiding goddeſs of their revels, and proceed to do juſtice to the harveſt-ſupper." [1]

Curious as this cuſtom is, its full bearing upon the old houſe-religion is ſeen by what Mr. Henderſon relates a little further on:—"Each cottage muſt at harveſt-time have its own houſehold divinity, and oaten cakes having formerly been the ſtaple food of the North, theſe figures are commonly formed of oats. Such have I repeatedly ſeen in cottages on the Tweed ſide, elaborately decorated and enſhrined at the top of the bink or dreſſer, with the family ſtock of big diſhes ranged on either ſide. Theſe, too, are kern-babies. I muſt add that throughout Northumberland, when the laſt cart of corn arrives at the ſtackyard gate, the driver leaves it ſtanding there while he carries his whip to the miſtreſs of the houſe, who muſt either drive in the load herſelf or give the man a glaſs of whiſky to do it for her." [2]

[1] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 87. Cf. Brand's "Popular Antiquities," ii., p. 20 *et ſeq.*

[2] Henderſon, *ibid.* I muſt give in this note the following curious cuſtom:—

"He ſhall know whether corne will be deere or cheape for

A near parallel to this is to be found in India. The firſt cutting of corn, not taken to the threſhing floor, but brought home to be eaten by the family, and preſented to the family gods and Brahmans, is called Arwan. When the Arwan is brought home, the grain is taken out of the ear, mixed up with milk and ſugar, and every member of the family taſtes it ſeven times.[1]

Here in definite terms folk-lore tells us that the prayers for the harveſt were preſented to the houſehold gods. Tranſlating the modern term "devil" into its archaic equivalent, we have evidence of the ſame primitive worſhip in the cuſtom ſtill prevalent in England and Scotland, of leaving a corner of the field uncultivated for "the aul man" or devil.[2]

the preſent yeere, and in which of the monethes thereof. Let him chooſe out at aduenture twelue graines of corne the firſt day of Januarie, let him make cleane the fire harth and kindle a fire thereupon; afterward let him call ſome boy or girle of his neighbours, or of his owne houſe; let him commaund the partie to put one of theſe graines of corne vpon the harth made very cleane and hot; then he ſhall marke if the ſaide graine doe leape or lie ſtill; if it leape a little, the corne ſhall be reaſonably cheape; but if it leape very much, it ſhall be very cheape; if it leape toward the fire more or leſſe, corne ſhall be more or leſſe deere; if it lie ſtill and leape not, then corne ſhall ſtand at one price for this firſt moneth: he ſhall do in like manner with the ſecond graine for the moneth of Februarie, and ſo in order with the reſt of the graines for the reſt of the monethes as they follow."—Surflet's *Maiſon Ruſtique; or, The Countrie Farme*, 1600, p. 39.

[1] Elliot's "History, Folk-Lore, &c., of N. W. Prov. of India," i., p. 197.

[2] Gregor's "Folk-Lore of North-Eaſt of Scotland," pp. 179,

Not leſs definitely connected with the hearth-worſhip is the old cuſtom of carrying fire round houſes, fields, &c., on the laſt night of the year, for the purpoſe of ſecuring fertility and general proſperity.[1] This fire was no doubt taken from the ſacred hearth. In the reign of Henry III. the ploughmen and other officers at Eaſt Monkton, between Warminiſter and Shafteſbury, were allowed a ram for a feaſt on the Eve of St. John the Baptiſt, when they uſed to carry fire round the lord's corn,[2] and Brand records that on the eve of Twelfth-day in Glouceſterſhire and Herefordſhire, fires uſed to be lit at the end of the lands in fields juſt ſown with wheat.[3] Remembering, too, as evidence has already ſhown, how the church has in ſo many inſtances taken the place of the houſehold altar, there are ſome cuſtoms incidental to the feaſt of Plough Monday which have an archaic origin in the primitive days of our anceſtors. At Aylmerton in Norfolk, Blomefield tells us, there was a light in many churches called Plough-light, maintained by old and young perſons

182; Henderſon, "Folk-Lore of Northern Counties," p. 278; Forbes Leſlie's "Early Races of Scotland," i., p. 152.

[1] Mitchell's "Paſt in the Preſent," p. 145. Compare the following curious cuſtoms of the Maya nations of America. "Before beginning the operation of weeding, they burned incenſe at the four corners of the field, and uttered fervent prayers to the idols."—Bancroft's *Native Races of the Pacific*, ii., p. 720.

[2] "Law Magazine and Review," vol. xiv., p. 350.

[3] "Popular Antiquities," i., p. 33. Compare the hallowing of the land deſcribed in the introduction to Sir George Daſent's "Burnt Njal."

who were huſbandmen, before ſome image; and on Plough Monday they had a feaſt, and went about with a plough and ſome dancers to ſupport it.[1]

To ſummarize ſomewhat the reſults of our reſearches thus far, let us conſider for one moment the principles underlying early village inſtitutions, and it will ſoon be ſeen what important influences theſe old beliefs were; how their reſults have laſted on into civilized ſociety; and how they helped the development of a pure and law-protected village life.

And firſt the houſe. This was not the individual property of a villager, nor was it occupied ſimply by a villager and his wife and children. It was the common property of the village, was built, as we have ſeen, by the aid of the whole community, and was occupied by a group of individuals known as the family of ancient ſociety. Under all theſe circumſtances there was encouragement enough to the intruſion of ſtrangers, and to the notion that home life was ſimply like any other branch of the community, communal in origin, and therefore open to all the unreſtrained wants and deſires of rough, uncultured barbarians. Againſt all this the houſe-religion, as I have traced it out in the preceding pages, turned a definite and powerful oppoſition, an oppoſition that ſet up the ſanctity and ſacredneſs of the houſe and all its ſurroundings, and hence allowed ſociety to build up aggregations of families into clans, of clans into tribes, of tribes into nations.

Secondly, the culture of the land. The village

[1] Blomefield's "Hiſtory of Norfolk," viii., p. 83.

community held lands in common. In their earlieſt ſtage, when the land upon which they had ſettled was unoccupied for a conſiderable extent around, their mode of cultivation was to clear a certain ſpace in the foreſt by felling the trees, burn the undergrowth, cultivate the clearing for two or three years, and then move on to another clearing. A later ſtage was, as I have deſcribed it in the opening chapter, to have the village boundaries fixed, and every villager to poſſeſs certain rights in common, not individually, over arable land, paſture land, and foreſt land. It is eaſily conceivable how theſe communal rights might be abuſed unleſs a firm hand were kept upon the villagers. Prudence we know, by many examples, does not enter much into the actions of early mankind, but its place is ſupplied by fear—the fear of the ſpirit-world, that is. In this firſt ſtage of agriculture, how were the foreſts protected from the unſparing hands and unthinking minds of the primitive cultivators? By ſuch influences as we find among the Hill Tribes of India. The Lakhimpur, Hunter ſays, have, like the Abars, a ſuperſtition which deters them from breaking freſh ground ſo long as their available fallow is ſufficient, namely, a dread of offending the ſpirits of the woods by unneceſſarily cutting down trees.[1] Have we not relics of this old fear in the "genius of the oak" recorded by Aubrey?[2] and in the ſuperſtition that to dream of a tree being uprooted in your garden is regarded as a death-warning to the

[1] Hunter's "Statiſtical Account of Aſſam," i., 349.

[2] See *antè*, p. 17.

owner?[1] But it is recorded as a poſitive law of the village community in India, Germany, and their Hebrew parallel, where the cutting down of trees is prohibited as a religious offence.[2]

Thus then, when we apply to comparative folk-lore to unlock ſome of the loſt knowledge treaſures of early village life, we gain ſomething more than a mere record of primitive ideas and cuſtoms. The cluſters of homeſteads which congregated together on lands belonging to the whole community, which were built by the whole community, which were occupied by groups of kindred men and women, were protected, each in its own inviolate ſecrecy, by the ſanctity of the houſehold ſpirit. They formed a ſacred precinct which ſheltered all the members of the community againſt the individual paſſions and rough-thought actions of men as yet untamed by civilization. Everything, ſays Dr. Hearn, done in the houſe or its precincts was private becauſe it was holy; and it was holy becauſe it was under the care of its own ſpecial houſe-ſpirit.[3] It is the acknowledged poſſeſſion of this faith which marks the point of Aryan progreſs from ſavage ſociety, which makes the home of the Aryan houſe-father a much more genial place than Sir George Cox has pictured it, "a den which its ſavage owner ſhares, indeed, with his mate and offspring, but which no other living being may enter except at the

[1] "Folk-Lore Record," i., p. 58.

[2] See an inſtructive paſſage on this curious ſubject in Fenton's "Early Hebrew Life," pp. 47-48.

[3] "The Aryan Houſehold," p. 222.

riſk of his life," a picture which might, indeed, be drawn from the ſavage counterparts of the folk-lore we have been conſidering, but which becomes brighter and brighter as we get to know that what the ſavage performed fitfully and fearfully, the early Aryan regulated into a ſyſtem which bound men together in home life, in clan life, and finally in national life.

CHAPTER VII.

EARLY DOMESTIC CUSTOMS.

IMPENETRABLE as the houſe of primitive ſociety was to the villagers as a body, guarded as it was by the enormous influences of the houſe-religion, yet it is not impoſſible to pull aſide theſe obſtacles by the aid of comparative folk-lore and to take a comprehenſive, even if incomplete, ſketch of ſome of the domeſtic uſages that were performed therein.

The primitive houſehold was made up of a family connected by blood, or aſſumed to be ſo, and conſiſting of ſeveral generations all living under one roof, worſhipping at the common houſehold altar, and obeying the head or chief. This communal family partook of the agricultural products of the village in proportion to its allotments in the village lands, and in turn diſtributed its ſhare among the individual members. And the manners and cuſtoms of ſavage or of early Aryan ſociety compared with the obſolete manners and cuſtoms, or the current ſuperſtitious practices of our own land, enable us to

aſcertain the principle of the communal mode of living within the early village homeſtead.

In an extremely valuable contribution to the ethnology of the American Indian tribes, publiſhed by the United States Government, Mr. Morgan has dealt exhauſtively with the ſubject of communiſm in living. Tracing through all its ſtages the law of hoſpitality, Mr. Morgan proceeds to deal with the uſages and cuſtoms relating to the American Indian communiſm in goods and food. It is only neceſſary to quote one or two of the inſtances here collected together. The Creek Indians live in cluſters of houſes, each cluſter containing a clan or family of relations who eat and live in common.[1] All the Indian tribes who hunt upon the plains obſerve the cuſtom of making common ſtock of the capture.[2] During the fiſhing ſeaſon in the Columbia river all the members of the tribe encamp together, and make a common ſtock of the fiſh obtained.[3] Among the Mandans, proviſions were in common.[4] Among the Maya Indians the lands are held and wrought in common, and the products ſhared by all, their food being prepared at one hut, and every family ſending for its portion.[5] The Iroquois had but one cooked meal each day. After its diviſion at the kettle among the members of the houſehold, it was ſerved warm to each perſon in earthen or wooden bowls. They had neither tables, nor chairs, nor plates.[6]

[1] Morgan's "Houſes and Houſe-life of the American Aborigines," p. 68.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 69.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 69.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 73.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 75.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 99.

Theſe examples picked out from Mr. Morgan's very valuable work are ſufficient to illuſtrate the North American cuſtom. Turning to Auſtralia, we meet with exactly the ſame evidence. An elaborate ſyſtem of diviſion was made according to the ſhare of the hunter in the proceſs of capture. In every caſe, however, whether large game or ſmall, the cooked food was divided by the procurer into certain portions which were allotted by cuſtom to various members of his family group, there being a common right to food in the family.[1] We doubtleſs have the ſame evidence in the following account of South African cuſtom. An ox is ſlaughtered at every wedding, and conſumed by the company; invited gueſts alone join in the dances, but anyone may help to conſume the meat. Marriage feaſts are thoſe which moſt frequently occur, but generally ſpeaking a feaſt takes place whenever there is beef to eat. If, for inſtance, a man has ſacrificed an ox to propitiate or thank his ſpirits, his neighbours aſſemble to devour it; if he have killed a beaſt to celebrate his daughter's eſpouſal, it will be conſumed in the ſame way.[2] When a Kafir is travelling he generally finds entertainment among his own tribe.[3] Mr. Thomas ſays of the Central South African tribes:—"Food is often regarded as common property, and when one family has a good meal provided, their neighbours have no ſcruple in inviting themſelves to a ſhare. When a quantity of beer is made,

[1] Fiſon and Howitt's "Kamilaroi and Kurnai," p. 207.
[2] Shooter's "Kafirs of Natal," p. 226.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

or an ox ſlaughtered, at a certain houſe, all the villagers, and even thoſe of neighbouring villages, will come together to partake of the feaſt."[1] Coming to the inſtructive cuſtoms of India, Sir John Phear tells us that it is the univerſal habit in Bengal, prevalent in all claſſes, for the members of a family to live joint, and to enjoy the profits of the property jointly.[2]

And now that the primitive houſehold has been ſplit up into the modern family in England, how do we find this communiſm in living repreſented? The gilds of the middle ages can be traced up to a tribal origin,[3] and one of their chief features is the common meal,[4] a plain trace of the ancient brotherhood of kinſmen, "joint in food, worſhip, and eſtate." Many of our manorial cuſtoms take us to the ſame pages of early village hiſtory. The tenants of many manorial communities were obliged to grind the corn at the common mill.[5] So, too, in ſome caſes, they had the right to feaſt—to partake of the common meal, in fact. Thus in moſt of the manors of Glaſtonbury Abbey the bailiffs and chief tenants dined in hall on Chriſtmas-day, and many other like inſtances occur.[6] The leets, like moſt other

[1] Thomas's "Central South Africa," p. 214.

[2] "The Aryan Village in India and Ceylon," p. 76.

[3] Dr. Sullivan's "Introduction to Materials for Ancient Iriſh Hiſtory," pp. ccvi. *et ſeq.*

[4] Dr. Brentano's Eſſay in Toulmin Smith's "Gilds," pp. lxv. *et ſeq.* Cf. Maine's "Early Hiſtory of Inſtitutions," p. 233; Spencer's "Political Inſtitutions," pp. 554-560.

[5] "Law Magazine and Review," xiv., p. 8.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 351.

gatherings, ended with good cheer, which were known by the name of leet-ales or ſcot-ales. Beſides leet-ales, however, there were church-ales, clerk-ales, bid-ales, and bride-ales, burial feaſts, and wedding feaſts, all of which are duly recorded among the popular antiquities of our land deſcribed in the well-known book of Brand's, and all of which, even in the fragmentary form in which they now appear before the ſtudent, take us back to the early communal houſehold of primitive times, when England was occupied, as barbaric countries are now occupied, by people who had not advanced along the line of civilization and development.

There are, however, one or two examples of theſe survivals of the ancient communal family-meal in England which are, perhaps, worth giving ſome account of. It is curious to note how houſe-cuſtoms crop up again. The houſe-warming that is ſo general amongſt us at the preſent day is no doubt a relic of the old communal feaſt, in which every villager took his ſhare as of right;[1] and an exact parallel exiſts among the North American Indians, for feſtivals, we are told, are given in the Alaſka villages on erecting a new houſe.[2] In Holſtein, turning for a moment to Continental folk-lore, among the cuſtoms now obſolete was that of Fenſterbier (window-beer), on making an additional

[1] Mr. Gregor notes the cuſtom in Scotland under the name of *booſe-beatin*, or *fire-kinlin*, the latter name no doubt indicating the kindling of the ſacred fire. "Folk-Lore of N. E. of Scotland," p. 51.

[2] "American Antiquarian," ii., p. 113.

window, or a new building, or even altering an old one, a feſtive dance accompanying the ſolemnity.[1] In Haſted's "Hiſtory of Kent[2] we find it recorded that the fiſhermen of Folkeſtone uſed to ſelect eight of the largeſt and beſt whitings out of every boat when they came home from fiſhing; theſe eight were ſold apart from the reſt, and the money devoted to make a feaſt on every Chriſtmas-day, which was called a Rumbald. The Welſh had an ancient cuſtom called the Cymhortha, in which the farmers of the diſtrict met together on a certain day to help the ſmall farmer plough his land, and each one contributed a leek to the common repaſt.[3]

Among the ancient Britons their chief meal was in the evening. Henry collects the following particulars from various Latin authorities. The gueſts ſat in a circle upon the ground, with a little hay, graſs, or the ſkin of ſome animal under them. A low table or ſtool was ſet before each perſon, with the portion of meat allotted to him upon it. If anyone found any difficulty in ſeparating any part of his meat with his hands and teeth, he made uſe of a large knife that lay in a particular place for the benefit of the whole company.[4] Henry quotes from "Oſſian's Poems" (vol. i. p. 15) the following graphic picture :—"It was on Cromla's ſhaggy ſide that Dorglas placed the deer .... A hundred youths collect the heath, ten heroes blow the fire; three

[1] "Literary Gazette," 1822, p. 882.
[2] Vol. iii., p. 380.
[3] Hampſon's "Medii Ævi Kalend.," i., pp. 107 and 170.
[4] Henry's "Hiſtory of Great Britain," i., p. 485.

hundred chuſe the poliſhed ſtones. The feaſt is ſmoking wide."[1] Remembering that the cooking by heated ſtones was the primitive practice (and we ſhall have ſomething to ſay about this preſently), we have here a curious example of a common meal.

Another very important contribution to the evidence of communiſm in living is contained in the hiſtory of the family cheſt. Perhaps there is no more ancient piece of furniture than the family cheſt, and I think I can give one or two notes which will ſhow how it has originated in the neceſſities and cuſtoms of early village life.

Among the New Zealanders we find a ſort of village cheſt. Polack ſays:—"In the *powáka* or village muſeum (boxes being the literal meaning) are placed the valuables of the community, fowling-pieces, eſteemed garments and foreign implements, trinkets, powder, and ſimilar articles equally valuable and of public utility."[2] And again, "Theſe boxes are cut from the red pine .... ſome of theſe boxes are heirlooms in a family."[3] This is parallel to the cheſts containing the perſonal chattels of the communal houſeholds of the North American Indians of Oregon.[4] Among the Neeah Indians each houſe is

[1] Henry's "Hiſtory of Great Britain," i., p. 482.

[2] "Manners and Cuſtoms of the New Zealanders," i., p. 210.

[3] Page 229. Pinkerton ſays too: "Their clothes, arms, feathers, ſome ill-made tools, and a cheſt, in which all theſe are depoſited, form all the furniture of the inſide of the houſe." —PINKERTON, *New Zealand*, xi., p. 542.

[4] See "Contributions to North American Ethnology," i., p. 174.

occupied by ſeveral families, and cheſts of quite large ſize, and very neatly made, conſidering the tools employed, contained the perſonal chattels of the owners. I cannot help connecting this village- or communal-cheſt with the houſe-cheſt of the Hindus; one ſurely is the archaic predeceſſor of the other, and it wants only ſome more information from ſavage ſociety to prove it. Among the Hindus, "according to the 'S'ilpa S'âſtra'—the Tamil treatiſe before quoted—every houſe ſhould have a box, technically termed *garbha*, in which to keep the family plate and jewels, and this box is kept in a certain part of the houſe aſtrologically determined upon."[1] Carrying on this archaic ſequence to the Weſtern branch of the Aryan family, I think we ſee a remnant of this primitive home furniture in "the cheſts for holding property which were uſed in England by all claſſes for many centuries, from the monarch, who carried them about in his progreſſes, to the pooreſt man who could afford to have a roof over his head." Mr. H. B. Wheatley ſupplies me with this laſt note, and refers me to the work of M. Jacquemart for ſome ſpecimens of theſe cheſts; and I would refer to Mr. Syer Cuming's article on Church Cheſts in the "Journal of the Archæological Aſſociation" (xxviii., pp. 225-230). There are alſo ſome fine examples in the South Kenſington Muſeum. The Anglo-Saxons made uſe of them as ſeats by day and beds by night. Then, again, among the Iriſh, one of the neceſſary articles pre-

[1] "Indian Antiquary," v., p. 233; Phear's "Aryan Village in India and Ceylon," p. 18.

ſented at every wedding is the hutch or Iriſh cheſt.[1]

If we may thus connect the primitive village-cheſt with the Aryan houſe-cheſt, we have yet another link between the village home of ancient ſociety and of modern; and theſe links, when all grouped together, help us to underſtand more explicitly the line of progreſs which civilization has made.

And ſo turning from the evidence of the primitive communal family meal to the uſages incidental to it, the ſuperſtitions of the preſent day reveal to us much information as to the nature and ſtructure of houſehold utenſils.

Engliſh folk-lore does not give us anything like what the practices of the Black Mountain peaſantry give us. There at the Chriſtmas feaſt—the primitive common meal—the iron fire-ſhovel, the low round table, the three-legged ſtools, and the one chair were removed from the neighbourhood of the hearth, and hidden away in any obſcure corner,[2] a cuſtom wonderfully ſignificant of times when "iron" and "tables" were unknown. The folk-lore attached to iron and to furniture does not tell us anything of the times when theſe were unknown, but the folk-lore of ſtones, on the other hand, tells us of the time when they were going out of uſe. Dr. Mitchell records that the ſpindle whorls uſed in Scotland had become known to the natives of the

[1] "Kilkenny Arch. Soc.," i., new series, p. 184. See alſo Brand's "Popular Antiquities," i., p. 461, note 1.

[2] "Macmillan's Magazine," January, 1881.

diſtrict where only one hundred years ago they were in full uſe, as adder ſtones.[1] Thus the old uſage had become enſhrined in popular ſuperſtition. In every part of Scotland theſe ancient tools and ancient weapons of ſimilar kind are believed to aſſiſt the birth of children, to increaſe the milk of cows, to cure diſeaſes of the eye, to protect houſes from lightning, and other marvellous virtues.[2] In Ireland we have the following curious account of ſuperſtitions attached to celts and ſtone implements :—"Theſe in the Weſt of Ireland, but eſpecially in the Arran Iſles, Galway Bay, are looked on with great ſuperſtition. They are ſuppoſed to be fairy darts or arrows, and are called *ſaighead* [ſyed], *anglicè* dart. They had been thrown by fairies, either in fights among themſelves, or at a mortal man or beaſt. The finder of one ſhould carefully put it in a hole in a wall or ditch. It ſhould not be brought into a houſe or given to anyone, yet the Aranites are very fond of making votive offerings of them at the holy wells on the mainland. They carry them to the different patrons and leave them there; the reaſon for this I could not make out; they do not ſeem to leave them at the holy wells on the iſlands."[3] And ſo we carry the records of ſtone ſuperſtitions into England. Aubrey records the hanging of a flint that has a hole in it over horſes that are hag-ridden.[4] Mr. Henderſon relates the uſe of "Iriſh ſtones" in

[1] "The Paſt in the Preſent," p. 6.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 156.
[3] "Folk-Lore Record," iv., p. 112.
[4] "Remaines of Gentiliſme and Judaiſme," pp. 28, 118.

Northumberland and the northern counties,[1] and the ſuperſtitions attaching to the flint "elf ſtones."[2] A writer in the "Journal of the Archæological Aſſociation" ſtates as follows :—"A naturally perforated ſtone and a horn are frequently ſeen appended to the keys of the doors of ſtables and cow-houſes and the gates of ſheepfolds. Aſk the groom or the cowboy why thoſe two things are ſelected in preference to any others, and they can give you no further reaſon than that they have ever been uſed for the purpoſe. Tell them that the perforated flint, the holy ſtone or hag-ſtone, is the taliſman employed from the moſt remote period to guard the cattle from the attacks of the fiendiſh Mara, the ephialtes, or nightmare, and that the horn is the enſign and emblem of the god Pan, the protector of cattle, and hence regarded as a potent charm and fit appendage to the key of the ſtable and cow-houſe, and they will laugh you to ſcorn. They nevertheleſs unknowingly perpetuate the moſt archaic ſuperſtitions, and thus become auxiliary in preſerving and illuſtrating the thoughts, rites, and practices of departed ages."[3]

Dr. Mitchell ſtates that the ſtone celt is known as a thunderbolt in Brazil, Japan, Java, Burmah, Aſſam, among the Malays in Weſtern Africa, and in many other countries, and cannot account for the iron-age man regarding as of celeſtial origin, and giving a god-like power to things manufac-

[1] "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 166.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 185.

[3] "Journ. Arch. Aſs.," xii., p. 129.

tured by his predeceſſors in culture.[1] Is not the explanation to be ſought for in the conſervatiſm of cuſtom? Expediency tells the iron-age man to uſe the iron knife, but regard for old uſages ſupplies him with the ſuperſtition that he muſt not put it near the fire,[2] that it will cut the friendſhip between him and others if he gives it away, that it is an inſtrument of divination.[3] And we have a picture of the rarity and value of iron in the early periods of its age in the Lancaſhire omen peculiar to ladies who conſider it lucky to find old iron, a horſe-ſhoe or ruſty nail being carefully conveyed home and hoarded up.[4]

Thus, irreſpective of the archæological finds of ſtone celts, and the records of the ſtone age, folk-lore tells us of the old utenſils uſed in the primitive houſehold. But the ſuperſtitions leading us back to this early period of village life, are followed cloſely by uſages which ſeem never to have broken away from prehiſtoric times. In Shetland the "knockin' ſtane" is ſtill found in common uſe. It conſiſts of a large ſtone, often a boulder, with a cup-like excavation on one ſide. Into this cup the barley is placed after being well dried; and it is then ſtruck repeatedly and ſteadily by a wooden mallet. As the blows fall, many of the grains ſtart out of the cup, but a woman or child, ſitting oppo-

[1] "The Paſt in the Preſent," p. 157.

[2] Tylor's "Early Hiſtory of Mankind," p. 275.

[3] Aubrey's "Remaines of Gentiliſme and Judaiſme," pp. 25, 92, 93.

[4] "Choice Notes, Folk-Lore," p. 61.

ſite the man who wields the mallet, keeps conſtantly putting them back.[1] Anything ruder than this way of making pot-barley, ſays Dr. Mitchell, could not eaſily be found. And the commentary upon this remark is, that the ſelf-ſame proceſs is found to be going on among ſavage peoples. Mr. Hutchinſon relates that in one of the courtyards of the little town of Gurowa there were three ladies pounding Indian corn in a large wooden mortar, each keeping a remarkable rhythmical accuracy of time in bruiſing with her peſtle, ſo as to chime in and not be at variance with the ſtroke of her companions.[2] And Mr. Abbott, in his recent book on "Primitive Induſtry," has devoted a whole chapter to the conſideration of the mortars and peſtles of the North American Indians. This pounding of barley in Scotland, and corn in Africa and America, with the mortar and peſtle, is paralleled by the curious quern, or hand-mill, by which the inhabitants of the houſe ground their own meal. Theſe querns, in Scotland, are found in hut circles, eirde-houſes, crannogs, and brochs, and they certainly may belong to the prehiſtoric, if not to the ſtone period. Yet they are not only ſtill in uſe in many parts of Scotland—moſt numerous in Shetland, Orkney, and the Hebridean iſlands—but are alſo ſtill employed by the ſavage races of many parts of the world.[3] Turn again to ſome modes of cooking food, the knowledge of

[1] Dr. Mitchell's "The Paſt in the Preſent," p. 44; cf. Kelly's "Indo-European Folk-Lore," p. 86.

[2] Hutchinſon's "Narrative of the Niger," p. 122.

[3] Dr. Mitchell's "The Paſt in the Preſent," p. 33.

which is derived from Scottiſh literature, and from actual practice ſtill followed in ſome remote parts of Scotland, and poſſibly in ſome diſtricts of cultured England. Theſe cuſtoms are thus related. Dr. Mitchell quotes from an old book that the Scots in time paſt uſed to ſeethe the fleſh of the animal they killed in the ſkin of the beaſt, filling the ſame with water; and Froiſſart tells us of their cooking their beef in ſkins ſtretched on four ſtakes.[1] The Iriſh did the ſame thing; they ſeethed pieces of beef and pork with the unwaſhed entrails of the beaſts in a hollow tree, lapped in a raw cow's hide, and ſo ſet over the fire.[2] In Andrew Boorde's "Introduction of Knowledge," edited by Mr. Furnivall for the Early Engliſh Text Society, the following curious deſcription of hide boiling is to be found:—"They wyll eate theyr meat ſyttyng on the ground or erth. And they wyl ſethe theyr meat in a beaſtes ſkyn. And the ſkyn ſhall be ſet on manye ſtakes of wood & than they wyll put in the water and the fleſhe. And than they wyl make a great fyre vnder the ſkyn betwyxt the ſtakes, & the ſkyn wyl not greatly bren. And whan the meate is eaten, they, for theyr drynke, wil drynk vp the brothe."[3]

The following account is quoted by Henry from Oſſian's "Poems" (vol. i., p. 15 note): "A pit lined with ſmooth ſtones was made; and near it ſtood a heap of ſmooth flat ſtones of the flint kind. The

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 121; alſo Tylor's "Primitive Culture," i., p. 40, quoting from Buchanan.

[2] Tylor's "Primitive Culture," i., p. 40.

[3] Page 132.

ſtones as well as the pit were properly heated with heath. They laid ſome veniſon in the bottom and a ſtratum of ſtones above it; and thus they did alternately until the pit was full. The whole was covered over with heath to confine the ſteam." [1]

Then there is another cuſtom on all fours with the ſtone ovens—cooking by means of hot ſtones. Dr. Mitchell tells us that this practice is ſtill extant in Scotland.[2] The Iriſh drank milk warmed with a ſtone firſt caſt into the fire,[3] and there ſeems to be little doubt but that the cuſtom has ſurvived in Engliſh folk-lore. In Wiltſhire the bakers, as Aubrey relates, take a certain pebble which they put in the vaulture of their oven, which they call the warning ſtone; for when that is white, the oven is hot.[4] This, ſurely, muſt refer back to times when heated ſtones were the uſual means of cooking food. In the "Folk-Lore Record" (vol. iii., p. 286), Mr. Peacock, writing to Dr. Tylor, relates that when his ſecond daughter was born—twenty-three years ago—his wife watched the nurſe waſhing the baby. She poured ſoft water from the ewer into the baſin, having firſt put the poker into the fire to make it red-hot. The nurſe then plunged the glowing poker into the baſin, and heated the water by that means. Mrs. Peacock aſked her why ſhe did not heat the water in the ordinary way, and was informed that ſoft water

[1] Henry's "Hiſtory of Great Britain," i., p. 482.
[2] "The Paſt in the Preſent," p. 121.
[3] Tylor's "Primitive Culture," i., p. 40.
[4] Aubrey's "Natural Hiſt. of Wiltſhire," p. 43.

made hot in this manner had fine healing qualities, and gave ſtrength to children. The practice was continued by the nurſe from day to day until the navel healed. His wife has ſince ſeen the ſame thing done in cottages in his neighbourhood, and has aſcertained that it is a prevailing cuſtom. The matter, ſays Mr. Peacock, ſeems intereſting when taken in connection with the facts collected as to *ſtone-boiling*. It is not ſafe to jump haſtily to concluſions, but it ſeems to me not improbable that we have here a caſe of ſurvival. The old way of heating water has long been diſcarded for the practical purpoſes of life, but, for the newly born, the ancient and therefore ſacred method may have been retained.

There cannot be any doubt, I think, but what Mr. Peacock is right in his conjecture that boiling by heated iron is a ſurvival from boiling by heated ſtone. The variation of this curious ſurvival of primitive cuſtom takes another ſhape in Scotland, a live coal being thrown into the water in which the new-born infant was being waſhed.[1]

Here, undoubtedly, we have a parallel ſtate of affairs to that which Mr. Peacock has referred to. For ordinary purpoſes, and in ordinary circles of life, the old way of heating had been long diſcarded. But the nurſery at the time of childbirth is not an ordinary circle of life. To reſort to the traditional means of obtaining the deſired proceſs of boiling is therefore a proceeding in ſtrict accord with the circumſtances, and it is in this way that folk-lore hands down to us the relics of primitive times in

[1] Gregor's "Folk-Lore of the North-East of Scotland," p. 7.

our own fatherland. Of courſe, in turning to the reſearches of archæologiſts, we meet with evidence of the ſtone-boiling mode of cooking among the buried remains of the earlieſt races of Britain. Thus, among other inſtances, at Finkley, near Andover, quantities of charred flints were dug up, indicating that the inhabitants had practiſed ſtone-boiling.[1] Further evidence can be adduced from the many ſites for flint-working obſervable on the low hills overlooking the watercourſes of North Hampſhire.[2] But whereas we naturally expect archæology to bring to light ſuch remnants of primitive life, becauſe they exiſt without contact with advancing civilization, we pauſe to conſider what is meant by that perſiſtence of cuſtom which brings down ſide by ſide with knowledge and ſcience, ſuperſtition and blind adherence to what has gone before.

Theſe practices all ſeem to be ſimple and primitive enough without any reference to the cuſtoms of ſavage people. But in addition to the evidence carried by the cuſtoms themſelves, there is ample means at hand for identifying theſe old cuſtoms of England, and Scotland, and Ireland with the exiſting cuſtoms of ſavages. Thus the Hottentots boil their victuals in leathern ſacks, and their water by means of heated ſtones.[3] The Eſquimaux uſed birchwood tubs, filling the veſſel with water and caſting in red-hot ſtones; and ſuch was the practice

[1] "Suſſex Arch. Coll.," xxiv., p. 163; ſee alſo "Kilkenny Arch. Soc.," ii., p. 121.

[2] "Suſſex Arch. Coll.," xxiv., p. 162.

[3] Lubbock's "Prehiſtoric Times," p. 339.

alſo of the Indians of California.[1] In Vancouver Iſland, whale-blubber and pieces of ſeal are prepared for food by being boiled in a wooden diſh, into which hot ſtones are thrown to heat the water. Another mode of cooking is to cover the fire with ſtones, on which water is ſprinkled, and the fiſh placed, mats ſaturated with water being thrown over all.[2] The cooking goes on in a corner of the houſe. Hot ſtones are put, by means of wooden tongs, into large wooden boxes containing a ſmall quantity of water. When the water boils, the blubber of the whale, cut into pieces about an inch thick, is thrown into theſe boxes, and hot ſtones are added until the food is cooked.[3] In Fiji the ovens are holes or pits ſunk in the earth, ſometimes eight or ten feet deep, and fifty feet in circumference, and in one of theſe ſeveral pigs and turtles, and a large quantity of vegetables can be cooked. The oven is filled with firewood, on which large ſtones are placed and the fire introduced. As ſoon as the fuel is burnt out, the food is placed on the hot ſtones, ſome of which are put inſide the animals to be cooked whole. A thick coat of leaves is now rapidly ſpread over all, and on theſe a layer of earth about four inches thick. When the ſteam penetrates this covering it is time to remove the food.[4]

Among the Malagaſy the vapour-bath is much uſed for the ſick. The patient is ſeated over a large

[1] "Tranſactions of the Ethnological Society," i., p. 133.
[2] Sproat's "Scenes and Studies of Savage Life," p. 54.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 61.
[4] Williams's "Fiji and the Fijians," i., p. 147.

earthen or other pan, containing water, ſpreading over him ſeveral large native cloths, and they produce the quantity of ſteam required by caſting pieces of iron or ſtones heated red-hot, into the water.[1] The South Sea iſlanders place the patient in a ſort of open-bottomed chair, which is fixed over a pile of ſtones heated red-hot and covered with herbs and graſs ſaturated with water.[2]

In Hawaii, near the ſouth end of the houſe, which was quite open, was the fire-place. The oven was a hole in the earth, three or four feet in diameter, and nearly a foot deep. A number of ſmall ſtones were ſpread over the bottom, a few dried leaves laid on them, and the neceſſary quantity of ſticks and firewood piled up and covered over with ſmall ſtones. The dry leaves were then kindled. When the ſtones were red-hot, they were ſpread over with a ſtick, the remaining firebrands taken away, and when the duſt and aſhes or the ſtones at the bottom had been bruſhed off with a green bough, the taro, wrapped in leaves, was laid on them till the oven was full, when a few more leaves were ſpread on the taro; the hot ſtones were then placed on theſe leaves, and a covering, ſix inches thick, of leaves and earth ſpread over the whole. In this ſtate the taro remained to ſteam or bake about half an hour. Sometimes the natives boil their food on heated ſtones, or roaſt it before the fire; but theſe ovens are moſt generally uſed for cooking their ſeveral kinds of vegetables.[3]

[1] Ellis's "Hiſtory of Madagaſcar," i., p. 223. [2] *Ibid.*
[3] Ellis's "Miſſionary Tour through Hawaii," p. 186.

The Malagaſy methods of dreſſing food are few. The moſt important part of their cookery conſiſts in preparing their rice, which is generally boiled in a large round earthen or iron pot with a very broad baſe; which is placed on the ſtones fixed in the hearth in the centre of the houſe.[1] The method of cooking crab-apples in Vancouver's Iſland, is to place them in a hole dug in the ground, over which green leaves are placed, and a fire kindled above all.[2] In Kalat they bake bread of millet in large balls with a heated ſtone in the centre.[3]

Among the North American Indians the cuſtom has ſurvived as a ſacred, not an ordinary cuſtom. The ceremony of roaſting the feſtival dog whole is yet obſerved by ſome tribes, who dig a pit and fill it with heated rock, the animal being enveloped and the pit covered with earth to retain the ſteam. The dog feaſt being a ſacred feaſt, the oven would conſequently be held in reverential eſteem.[4]

To conclude theſe examples of the primitive cuſtoms of cooking food, I will turn to ſome of the Polyneſian ſtories as related by Sir George Grey. "A great meeting of all the people of his tribe was held by Manaia to remove a tapu, and when the religious part of the ceremony was ended, the women cooked food for the ſtrangers. When the ovens were opened, the food in the oven of Kuiwai, the wife of Manaia, was found to be very much under-

[1] Ellis's "Hiſtory of Madagaſcar," i., p. 205.
[2] Sproat's "Scenes and Studies of Savage Life," p. 56.
[3] "Journ. Aſiatic Soc. of Bengal," xii., p. 478.
[4] "Traditions of De-Coo-Dah," by W. Pidgeon, p. 26.

done, and Manaia was very angry with his wife, and gave her a ſevere beating, and curſed, ſaying, 'Accurſed be your head; are the logs of firewood as ſacred as the bones of your brother, that you were ſo ſparing of them as not to put into the fire in which the ſtones were heated enough to make them red-hot? Will you dare to do the like again? If you do, I'll ſerve the fleſh of your brother in the ſame way, it ſhall frizzle on the red-hot ſtones of Waikorora.'"[1] And, again, we come acroſs the following paſſage elſewhere:—"They had prepared ovens to cook the bodies in, and theſe were all lying open ready for their victims, and by the ſides of the ovens they had laid in mounds the green leaves, all prepared to place upon the victims before the earth was heaped in to cover them up, and the firewood and the ſtones were alſo lying ready to be heated."[2]

Thus far then the primitive family life as we know it muſt have exiſted amongſt our anceſtors, becauſe ſufficient traces of it are to be found in modern ſuperſtitions and old cuſtoms. But is there nothing to identify the perſonal fancies and ideas of the individual member of the family? can we not hit upon ſome traces of the Engliſh ſavage? To theſe queſtions the ſtudy of comparative folk-lore does not turn an unheeding ear, and the few examples which I collect together in the following

[1] Grey's "Polyneſian Mythology," p. 162-3.

[2] Grey's "Polyneſian Mythology," p. 172. I muſt content myſelf with a reference to Taylor's "Te Ika a Maui, or New Zealand," p. 503, for an account of the ſtone ovens in New Zealand, and to p. 504 for the ſame cuſtom in South Auſtralia.

pages may be conſidered as typical of what may come by ſtill further reſearch.

A group of ſuperſtitions in reference to the human hair ſhow a remarkable extenſion of ſimilar cuſtoms in all parts of the world, but I will juſt mention one or two inſtances out of the many that crowd upon one in order to illuſtrate the connection between the primitive ſociety of Britain and its folk-lore ſurvivals, with the ſavage ſociety of modern times. In various parts of the world, ſays Sir John Lubbock, a myſterious connection is ſuppoſed to exiſt between the cut lock of hair and the perſon to whom it belonged.[1] Thus in India, in dangerous ſickneſs the hair is ſometimes cut off and offered to a deity, as in old Greece.[2] In Grey's "Polyneſian Mythology" we read :—"Whakatau landed on the coaſt, and before eating anything offered the preſcribed ſacrifice of the hair and a part of the ſkin of the head of one of his victims to the gods; and when the religious rites were finiſhed he eat food."[3] In New Zealand cutting the hair was done with much ceremony and repeating many ſpells; the operator was made *tapu* for his ſervices. When the hair was cut a portion was thrown into the fire, and a *karakia* was uttered to avert the bad effects of thunder and lightning, which were ſuppoſed to be occaſioned by this potent operation.[4] In one place the moſt ſacred day of the year was that appointed

[1] "Prehiſtoric Times," p. 471.
[2] "The Indian Antiquary," v., p. 21.
[3] Grey's "Polyneſian Mythology," p. 120.
[4] Taylor's "New Zealand," p. 206.

for hair-cutting;[1] and Shortland ſays, the hair cut from the head was depoſited on ſome ſacred ſpot of ground.[2] Well, in England we have the ſelfſame idea at work in the ſuperſtitions connected with the hair. Its ſudden loſs is prognoſtic of the loſs of children, health, or property.[3] If a perſon's hair burn brightly when thrown into the fire, it is a ſign of longevity; on the other hand, if it ſmoulder away, it is a ſign of approaching death.[4] Some further illuſtrations I muſt quote from Mr. Henderſon's book. Among the lower orders in Ireland it is held that human hair ſhould never be burnt, only buried, becauſe at the reſurrection the former owner of the hair will come to ſeek it. Neither ſhould it be thrown careleſſly away, leſt ſome bird ſhould find it and carry it off, cauſing the owner's head to ache all the time the bird was buſy working the hair into its neſt. "I knew how it would be," exclaimed a Suſſex ſervant one day to her miſtreſs, "when I ſaw that bird fly off with a bit of my hair in its beak, that flew out of the window this morning while I was dreſſing. I knew I ſhould have a clapping headache, and ſo I have."[5]

A remedy current in Sunderland for whooping-cough belongs to the ſame group of parallels. The crown of the head is ſhaved, and the hair hung upon a buſh or tree, in firm belief that the birds

[1] Taylor's "New Zealand," p. 207.
[2] "Traditions of New Zealand," p. 110.
[3] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 111.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 112. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 112.

carrying it away to their neſts will carry away the cough along with it. A ſimilar notion lies at the root of a mode of cure practiſed in Northamptonſhire and Devonſhire alike. Put a hair of the patient's head between two ſlices of buttered bread, and give it to a dog. The dog will get the cough, and the patient loſe it, as ſurely as ſcarlet fever is transferred from a human being to an aſs by mixing ſome of the hair of the former with the aſs's fodder.[1] The folk-lore connected with hair is too extenſive, however, to examine further.

Two curious charms, very nearly parallel in Engliſh folk-lore and New Zealand cuſtom may be recorded here. The following charm for tooth-ache is copied *verbatim et literatim* from the fly-leaf of a Common Prayer-book once belonging to a Suſſex labourer:—"As Peter ſat weeping on a marvel ſtone Chriſt came by and ſaid unto him, Peter, what aileſt thou? Peter anſwered and ſaid unto him, My Lord and my God, my tooth eaketh. Jeſus ſaid unto him, Ariſe, Peter, and be thou hole, and not the only but all them that carry theſe lines for my ſake ſhall never have the tooth ake.—Joſeph Hylands, his book."[2] This, as a word-charm, is not very far removed from the following charm as practiſed in New Zealand:—

> "An eel, a ſpiny back,
> True indeed, indeed; true in ſooth, in ſooth,
> You muſt cut the head
> Of ſaid ſpiny back."

[1] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of Northern Counties," p. 143.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

"He tuna, he tara
Pu-ano-ano, pu-are-are.
Mau e kai i te upoko
O taua tara-tu."[1]

In Shetland, ſays Mr. Henderſon, the following words are uſed to heal a burn :—

"Here come I to cure a burnt ſore,
If the dead knew what the living endure
The burnt ſore would burn no more."[2]

The Suſſex charm for the ſame purpoſe is different, and can only be uſed with good effect on Sunday evening. Mrs. Latham ſays that a poor perſon of that county who was ſeverely ſcalded peremptorily refuſed to ſee a doctor or try any remedy till Sunday evening came round. She then ſent for an old woman, who "bowed her head over the wound, croſſed two of her fingers over it, and, after repeating ſome words to herſelf, huffed or breathed quickly on it." The words were as follows :—

"There came two angels from the north,
One was Fire and one was Froſt.
Out Fire, in Froſt,
In the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt."[3]

But this is not far removed, in *motif* at all events, from the following New Zealand charm :—

"What cauſed the burn?
Fire cauſed the burn.
Fire kindled by whom?
Fire kindled by Mahu-ika [the goddeſs of fire].
Come and fetch ſome (fire), ſpread it out,

[1] Shortland's "New Zealanders," p. 131.
[2] "Folk-Lore of Northern Counties," p. 171.
[3] "Folk-Lore Record," i., p. 35.

To be a ſlave to dreſs food for both of us.
Small burn, large burn,
Burn be cruſted over with ſkin.
I will make it ſacred,
I will make it effective." [1]

I will now enumerate one or two miſcellaneous ſuperſtitions which belong to this diviſion of our ſubject. In Polyneſia, if the long-legged ſpider drops down from above in front of you or in your boſom, it is a good ſign, foreboding either preſents or ſtrangers; if he drops on either ſide, or behind you, the ſign brings you no good.[2] And in England, a ſpider deſcending upon you from the roof is a token that you will ſoon have a legacy from a friend. In Ireland the ſaying is, if a ſpider be found running over the dreſs or ſhawl of a woman, the garment will ſoon be replaced by a new one.[3] Again, the Polyneſian notion is, if you have a ringing ſound in your ears, it is a ſign that you are ſpoken evil of by ſome one: if in the right ear, by a man; if in the left ear, by a woman: ſometimes it indicates approaching ſickneſs.[4] This is, of courſe, the well-known Engliſh omen, if the right ear tingles you are being ſpoken well of, if the left ear ſome one is ſpeaking ill of you.[5]

[1] Shortland's "New Zealanders," p. 134; Taylor's "Te Ika a Maui; or, New Zealand and its Inhabitants," p. 182.

[2] Fornander's "Polyneſian Race," i., p. 239.

[3] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 111.

[4] Fornander's "Polyneſian Race," i., p. 239.

[5] Henderſon, *loc. cit.*, p. 113. One cannot tell if theſe two Polyneſian omens have been derived from European ſources, certainly the parallel is remarkable enough for ſuch a cauſe.

We now come to the nurſery, and here we ſtep upon the very threſhold of archaic cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions. Mothers have told children ſtories that were no longer believed in in the dining-hall or drawing-room; they have quietly performed cuſtoms and practiſed ſuperſtitious obſervances with their children when they could not or would not do ſo upon the grown-up members of their family. There is thus repreſented in the childhood of the preſent generation many of the faiths and beliefs of the childhood of the nation.

Innumerable almoſt are the cuſtoms attending childbirth. The hour and day of an infant's birth are as much a matter of ſolicitude to the Chineſe female as to the wiſe-woman of our own North Country hamlets. Thus, in China, title and degree will be the lot of him who is born at noon. The child who makes his appearance between nine and eleven o'clock will have a hard lot at firſt, but finally great riches. Toil and ſorrow will be the lot of the unlucky babe who firſt ſees the light between three and five.[1] If the Chineſe lay great ſtreſs upon the hour, we in England attribute to the day a taliſmanic influence over the future of the new-born child. Thus—

"Monday's child is fair of face,
Tueſday's child is full of grace,
Wedneſday's child is full of woe,
And Thurſday's child has far to go.

"Friday's child is loving and giving,
And Saturday's child works hard for its living;

[1] Dennys' "Folk-Lore of China," p. 8.

But the child that is born on the Sabbath-day,
Is blithe and bonny, good and gay."[1]

And, in Yorkſhire, children born during the hour after midnight have the power through life of ſeeing the ſpirits of the departed.[2] Among the Karens, children are ſuppoſed to come into the world defiled, and that defilement is removed by a long proceſs, which ends in the child being named;[3] and our Northern folk-lore is unanimous, ſays Mr. Henderſon, in bearing witneſs to the power of baptiſm.[4]

In Aſtor, till the child receives a name, the woman is declared impure for the ſeven days previous to the ceremony. In Ghilgit, twenty-ſeven days are allowed to elapſe till the woman is declared pure. Then the bed and clothes are waſhed, and the woman is reſtored to the company of her huſband and the viſits of her friends.[5] Curious as all this is, it meets with a cloſe parallel in Scotland. The Reverend Walter Gregor ſays:—"Strict watch was kept over both mother and child till the mother was churched and the child was baptized, and in the doing of both all convenient ſpeed was uſed. For, beſides expoſure to the danger of being carried off by the fairies, the mother was under great reſtrictions till churched. She was not allowed to do any kind of work, at leaſt any kind of work more than the moſt ſimple and neceſſary. Neither was ſhe permitted to enter

[1] Henderſon, *loc. cit.*, p. 9.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[3] "Journ. Aſiatic Soc., Bengal," xxxv. (2), pp. 9, 10.
[4] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 15.
[5] "Indian Antiquary," i., p. 11.

a neighbour's houſe, and had ſhe attempted to do ſo, ſome would have gone the length of offering a ſtout reſiſtance, and for the reaſon that, if there chanced to be in the houſe a woman great with child, travail would prove difficult with her." [1]

Dr. Livingſtone records that amongſt the Bakaa and Bakwain tribes, a child which cuts its upper front teeth before the lower ones is put to death. Such a practice alſo exiſts at Aboh and Old Kalabar, on the Weſt Coaſt of Africa; [2] and, in England, the cruel cuſtom has doubtleſs ſurvived in the ſuperſtitious omen that, if a child tooths firſt in its upper jaw, it is conſidered ominous of death in infancy. [3]

A curious little piece of folk-lore is common alike to China and England, namely, the wide-ſpread ſuperſtition againſt rocking an empty cradle. [4]

Mr. Henderſon records a caution againſt rocking a cradle when it is "toom," or empty, and cites on the ſubject the following fragment:

"The Toom Cradle.

"Oh! rock not the cradle when the babie's not in,
For this by old women is counted a ſin;
It's a crime ſo inhuman it may na' be forgi'en,
And they that wi' do it ha' loſt ſight of heaven.

"Such rocking maun bring on the babie diſeaſe,
Well may it grow fretty that none can it pleaſe,

[1] Gregor's "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," pp. 5, 6.

[2] "Tranſactions of the Ethnological Society," i., p. 337.

[3] Henderſon, "Folk-Lore of Northern Counties," p. 20.

[4] Dennys' "Folk-Lore of China," p. 13, and Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," pp. 18, 19.

Its crimſon lip pale grows, its clear eye wax dim,
Its beauty grow pale, and its viſage wax dim,
"Its heart flutters faſt, it breathes hard, then is gone,
To the fair land of heaven." * * * * *

The belief thus expreſſed holds its ground in the ſouthern counties of Scotland, particularly in Selkirkſhire. Rocking the toom cradle is often deprecated in the counties of Durham and Yorkſhire on another ground; it is ſaid there to be ominous of another claimant for that place of reſt.

In Suſſex they expreſs this notion in the couplet—

"If you rock the cradle empty,
Then you ſhall have babies plenty."

Chineſe nurſes in the South of China have preciſely the ſame belief. A little four-year-old girl, who is a very intimate acquaintance of mine (ſays Dr. Dennys), not long ago, began rocking the cradle in which her newly-born ſiſter was uſually laid to ſlep. An Amah, who ſaw her, ruſhed at the child, exclaiming, "You no makee rock ſo faſhion! That baby b'long die, f'poſie rock." As it happened, the infant did die, as was fully expected by the medical attendant; but, of courſe, the Amah found in the anticipated fact a verification of her prediction; and farther inquiry has ſatisfied me that the ſuperſtition is identical with, and quite as wideſpread as our own.[1]

In China, a pair of trouſers of the child's father are put on the frame of the bedſtead in ſuch a way that the waiſt ſhall hang downward, or be lower than the legs. On the trouſers is ſtuck a piece of

[1] Dennys' "Folk-Lore of China," p. 13.

red paper, having four words written upon it, intimating that all unfavourable influences are to go into the trouſers, inſtead of afflicting the babe. A package of ſeed, ruſh (ſuch as is uſed for candle-wicks), cat's and dog's hair, onions or garlic, a pair of chopſticks, and ſome charcoal is, in Fuhkien, tied up with red ſtring, in a piece of red paper, and ſuſpended on the outſide of the door where the mother is lying.[1] All this is for the protection of the child from the influences of the ſpirit world. In Scotland, the danger of being carried off by the fairies was ever preſent to the mind of the anxious mother; and Mr. Gregor records the exact parallel to the Chineſe cuſtom of hanging up a pair of trouſers at the foot of the bed, as a preſervative againſt the influences of the fairies.[2] Mr. Napier alſo has a word to ſay upon the ſubject, and he adds the additional information that coral beads are hung round the necks of babies to preſerve them from the effect of the evil eye.[3]

Whether the picture produced by the ſtudy of the various phaſes of belief which have been detailed in the previous pages, is ſufficiently vivid to have brought the reader to ſtand in imagination at the threſhold of the primitive home, I do not know, but I would still claim his attention one moment longer. That threſhold before which we lingered ſo long, and over which we have now ſtepped, has ſtill another connection with olden days when we

[1] Dennys' "Folk-Lore of China," p. 13.
[2] Gregor's "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," p. 5.
[3] Napier's "Folk-Lore of Weſt of Scotland," p. 36.

ſtand upon it in the act of leaving. As in entering a houſe one muſt be careful to put the "right foot" foremoſt, a piece of ſuperſtition which even Dr. Johnſon is ſaid to have carefully practiſed,[1] and which the Malagaſy alſo adhere to;[2] ſo in leaving a houſe, if we can truſt to the accuracy of our authorities, and the non-impoſition of European influences, we meet with ſimilar ideas in England and Polyneſia. Henderſon records the piece of Engliſh folk-lore[3] which is exactly parallel to the following. If, ſtarting on a journey, you were called after, or called back by ſomebody, it was a bad ſign.[4] If ſtarting away from a place, and having actually proceeded ſome diſtance from the houſe, however ſhort, you turned back after ſomething forgotten or left, it was a bad ſign.[5] Again, if iſſuing from the houſe you ſee or meet a hare, it is an evil omen in India,[6] among the Arab tribes, the Laplanders, and the Namaquas, a South African tribe,[7] as it was in Scotland, and is among the Corniſh miners of England,[8] and, indeed, in almoſt all parts of Great Britain. A Yorkſhire fiſherman will not put out to ſea if on leaving his cottage he meets a woman,[9]

[1] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 116.

[2] "Folk-Lore Record," ii., p. 36.

[3] "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 117, and ſee alſo Gregor's "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," p. 30.

[4] Fornander's "Polyneſian Race," i., p. 238.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] "Indian Antiquary," v., p. 21.

[7] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 204.

[8] Tylor's "Primitive Culture," i., p. 109.

[9] "Notes and Queries," 5th ſer., ii., p. 183.

and a Hindu would conſider a Brahmin widow an evil omen for his journey.[1] Theſe, perhaps, may be conſidered the accidents of folk-lore, but they furniſh inſtructive materials to cloſe our examination of primitive houſe-life in Britain.

We have now gathered up ſome conſiderable remnants of the home-world of primitive ſociety in Britain. It is not a home-world like that of modern days, becauſe it contains within itſelf nearly all that is now transferred to the State. It had its own chief, its children, and ſlaves; it had its own means of providing food and clothing for its inmates, and, above all, it had its own religion and its own temple. From ſuch an organization as this has been built up, bit by bit, the State organization. At every ſtep in the progreſs of the State the primitive houſehold was deſpoiled of ſome of its old-world elements. We have to talk of folk-lore, not of actual cuſtom, or actual houſe-worſhip; we have to talk of the village church, not of the houſe-temple; we have to talk of ſuperſtitious omens and beliefs, not of the belief in protecting ſpirits; we have to appeal to the legal force of the protective police, not of the religious force of the local gods. If, therefore, with all this difference between us and thoſe to whom folk-lore properly belongs, we have come acroſs, or left unconſidered, ſome imperfect analogies between Engliſh folk-lore and primitive cuſtom, the imperfection is the reſult of the filtration of ages through which folk-lore has paſſed in its journey to modern days.

[1] "Indian Antiquary," v., p. 21.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE VILLAGE MARRIAGE.

IN a previous chapter detailing the connection of the houſe-gods with the gods of agriculture, ſome evidence was afforded of the relationſhip of the homeſtead to the village in primitive ſociety. That relationſhip had definite and eſtabliſhed principles to ſupport it, and if in the preſent volume it were intended to carry forward the reſearches into other branches of primitive ſociety, there would be many important facts to mention, illuſtrating this ſubject. One group of facts, namely, thoſe relating to the village marriage, I propoſe explaining in the preſent volume, becauſe, perhaps more than any other ſubject, that of marriage bears out the principles and aſſociations which have been placed before the reader in connection with thoſe other branches of early village life already conſidered; and becauſe, having already dealt with the houſe cuſtoms of marriage, wherein the bride is delivered over, ſo to ſpeak, by the community at large, to the individual

houſe, it will be well to continue the narrative of the ancient marriage inſtitution and go outſide the houſe, and ſee how the primitive villagers acted in regard to, and what ideas they aſſociated with, the marriage of one of their members.

The leading principle with which we muſt approach the ſubject is, that outſide the houſe in primitive ſociety, individuality became merged in the general communal principles of the villagers. Ceremonies that now have no relation to any one beyond each family, were in primitive times the buſineſs of the whole community. Village feaſts and cuſtoms that now intereſt a claſs only, and are kept up for pleaſure and enjoyment, were once important events in the hiſtory of the community, and impoſed duties and attention from all members. Thus marriages, births, and deaths were matters which concerned the community almoſt as much as they did the family more nearly intereſted in them. In all theſe matters we muſt never loſe ſight of the fact that man in his primitive ſtate was not recognized individually, did not hold perſonal property, did not belong to his community on account of his own choice of location, but on account of his birth within it.

Now this communal principle of ſocial life has exiſted from the earlieſt times down to hiſtorical times. It exiſts among the loweſt types of ſociety, and it exiſted among the types which have developed into modern civilization. There are inſtances of ſocial groups where everything appears to be held in common, where only mere perſonal articles, ſuch

as bow and arrow, the ornaments and ſcanty clothing, are held as individual property.[1] At a new ſtage of development, as among paſtoral tribes, we meet with certain claſſes of property only held in common, certain other claſſes having become the property of the individual owner. As a final ſtage, as among agricultural tribes, we have a communal property of the cultivated lands and an individual property in the homeſtead. Thus, throughout all the ſtages of primitive ſociety, there exiſt forms, ſuitable to each particular ſtage, of a community of property, and roughly theſe may be divided as follows:—firſt, a community of all things; ſecondly, a community of flocks and herds, and animals of the chaſe; thirdly, a community of agricultural lands. And a further important ſtage of this principle of ſocial life is repreſented by the ſurvival to a remarkable degree of the agricultural community, and the reſults of the agricultural community, in all the civilized ſocieties of the Weſtern world. Even when we firſt come upon this primitive community in early Europe, nay, in early Britain, it is remarkably complete in its primitive features. Every community was practically interdependent. It had its own food grounds, its own cattle, its own means of making clothing, and neigh-

[1] The ſavage, ſays Mr. Spencer, lacks the extended conſciouſneſs of individual poſſeſſion, and under his conditions it is impoſſible for him to have it. Beyond the few rude appliances miniſtering to his bodily wants, the primitive man has nothing that he can accumulate—there is no ſphere for an acquiſitive tendency (Spencer's "Principles of Sociology," i., p. 68).

bouring communities were generally conſidered with jealouſy, if not with hatred, and warlike animoſities. All theſe facts are demonſtrable of our own land. They cannot be ſtated now at length, but the reſearches of Sir Henry Maine in England and Von Maurer and Gneiſt in Germany, bring together a body of proof which takes back many English local cuſtoms to the primitive village community, in its moſt normal ſtate, for the only poſſible explanation of their origin.

Sir John Lubbock obſerves that it is very remarkable indeed how perſiſtent are all cuſtoms and ceremonies connected with marriage.[1] We have now exiſting amongſt us cuſtoms and ceremonies that can be traced down from primitive times; and although many writers have dealt with this ſubject very thoroughly, and from different points of view, it appears to me that there is one important aſpect of it that has been altogether loſt ſight of, and that is its connection with early village life. Profeſſor Max Müller ſays:—"To the preſent day, marriage, the moſt important of civil acts, the very foundation of civilized life, has retained the religious character which it had from the very beginning of hiſtory."[2] But this is, in reality, only half a truth.

[1] "Origin of Civilization," p. 85.

[2] Lectures on the Science of Religion, "Macmillan's Magazine," June, 1870, p. 697. It is curious to obſerve the ſignificant reſearches of Thrupp on the Anglo-Saxon wife. He endeavours to demonſtrate the non-religious characteriſtic of the ceremony by pointing out the ſtruggle the Church underwent to get the marriage ceremony out of the hands of the bride's father, who of old performed it! The bride's father

From the beginning of *Aryan* hiſtory there has been a ſanctification of the giving up by the community of its rights over one of its daughters; there has been, in other words, an encroachment of the houſe-religion into the domain of village rights. We have ſeen how the ritual of the houſe-religion, upon the introduction of a new daughter-inmate, exerciſed its own peculiar influence on the minds of primitive man. But the marriage rite ended at the houſe-altar; it began, and poſſeſſed moſt ſignificance and exerciſed far more ancient ceremonies in the village far away from religious ritual and wholly within the influence of ſocial ritual. Nothing appears to me to be a more important reſult of the ſtudy of comparative folk-lore than the many indications it gives of the extenſion of the houſe-religion, the abſorption of older village rites into a newer family religion: already, in the caſe of agriculture, this has been pointed out; in the caſe of marriage, the proceſs is very nearly the ſame.

In treating of the many marriage cuſtoms, therefore, as they exiſt in England at preſent, it is neceſſary to bear in mind that, if they are to be traced up to archaic times for their origin, they muſt be traced from a ſtandpoint very different to the purely family aſpect which at preſent ſurrounds them. We muſt break through that family and perſonal idea altogether, and in its place think of marriage as an inſtitution of the community. By

was, of courſe, the Houſe-prieſt, and the ritual which Thrupp could not obtain from hiſtorical ſources we have obtained from folk-lore. (See Thrupp's "Anglo-Saxon Home," pp. 50-57.)

this means we ſhall have explained to us many hitherto unexplained cuſtoms connected with marriages, and we ſhall be able to group them into ſections having an hiſtorical relationſhip to one another, and ultimately leading us to the ſame ground we have already occupied in other branches of comparative folk-lore.

Ancient law tells the ſtudent that the members of the primitive community, ſo ſoon as it appears upon the borderland of civilization, were bound together by the cloſeſt ties of blood or fictitious relationſhip, and of common intereſts and duties. In all things (ſays Mr. Fenton[1]), the villager muſt conſider the rights of his fellows—he muſt aſſiſt his fellows, even in family matters. Reciprocal aid and ſuccour, extended even to marital duties. It was neceſſary to rear good men for the community,[2] and this queſtion was relegated, not to individual choice, but to communal neceſſities and advantages. The marriage of one of the daughters of the community, or the marriage of one of its ſons, was a matter, therefore, of public conſideration, and hence of public ratification. How clearly this notion exiſts even among Aryan people is beſt ſeen by a reference to Plato. Profeſſor Jowett ſays: —[3]

"In forming marriage connections, Plato ſup-

[1] "Early Hebrew Life," p. 31.

[2] That primitive Aryan ſociety was ſtrongly founded upon the neceſſity of ſucceſſion to the houſe is ſhown by many authorities, but ſee a ſummary in Hearn's "Aryan Houſehold," p. 79.

[3] Jowett's "Plato," iv., Introduction, p. 114.

poſes that the public intereſt will prevail over private inclinations. There was nothing in this very ſhocking to the notions of Greeks, among whom the feeling of love towards the other ſex was almoſt deprived of ſentiment or romance. Married life is to be regulated ſolely with a view to the good of the State. The newly-married couple are not allowed to abſent themſelves from their reſpective ſyſſitia, even during their honeymoon; they are to give their whole mind to the procreation of children." Sir John Lubbock ſays from the evidence of ſavage ſociety, that marriage was, in fact, an infringement upon communal rights; the man retaining to himſelf, or the man and woman mutually appropriating to one another, that which ſhould have belonged to the whole tribe.[1]

Such, in brief, are the initial facts which will help us to rightly group ſome marriage cuſtoms which appear in parallel lines in England and among ſavage tribes. Of courſe they are kept up in modern England, and have been kept up for centuries, without any thought of their archaic meaning, and it is only now by comparing them with primitive thought and primitive ſocial forms that we are able to add to them in the pages of ſcientific reſearch what they have long loſt in actual fact.

What I ſay, then, is that, as in queſtions of property, as in queſtions of the individuality of each member of the community, the ſocial group acted collectively, ſo, in queſtions of birth, of death, of

[1] "Origin of Civilization," p. 71.

marriage, the ſocial group acted collectively. Infanticide, ſo prevalent among ſavage races, was a group-act, and was carried out, not at all by the feelings of individual cruelty, but by the neceſſities of the community. So, again, with homicide: the practice of killing the aged and infirm was not the reſult of individual cruelty, but of communal action; and the many remarkable inſtances of funeral ceremonies being an important portion of the legal ſucceſſion to property and houſehold chieftainſhip, come within the ſame category. In exactly the ſame way I claſſify the various cuſtoms of marriage —the individual, having no ſpecial powers of his own, acted on behalf, and in accordance with, the wiſhes of the community. I conceive that by this claſſification we can arrive at many ſtages of development in marriage cuſtoms, juſt as we arrive at many ſtages of development in the ſocial group; and as the communal group ſtands at the threſhold of Engliſh hiſtory, ſo I conceive that the marriage cuſtoms of England ſtand there too, and go with the hiſtory of the village community right back into the earlieſt life of man.

As my theory of the connection between the marriage cuſtoms of civilized Britain and thoſe of the ſavage world to a conſiderable extent reconſtructs a new theory of the origin of marriage, about which ſo much has been written, my examples muſt illuſtrate three diſtinct diviſions—(1) the commencement of marriage wholly as a group-act; (2) the development of the group-act—which we find repreſented partly by the marriage cuſtom, and partly by

the rights of huſband and wife; and (3) the ſurvival of the group-act—in which we find a keeping-up of cuſtoms that are explainable only by reference to the two former ſtages. Throughout theſe three ſtages the inſtitution of marriage has maintained its diſtinctive characteriſtics as a group-act, not as a perſonal or family act. In the communal ſtage, by which term I may, perhaps, deſignate the firſt-mentioned diviſion, the whole tribe marries a whole ſet of wives. In the marital ſtages, which may deſignate the two next diviſions, the group-act is repreſented by the whole tribe aſſiſting either to capture a wife, or to purchaſe a wife for any one of its members, and conſequently joining, as of right, in the ceremonies and feſtivities which gradually grew up around the marriage ceremony.

In producing evidence of the communal ſtage of marriage rites, as I have ventured to term it, it will only be neceſſary to draw attention to one or two examples from ſavage ſociety. In one ſpecial inſtance—that of the Auſtralians—we ſhall have the advantage, not often to be obtained, of uſing the reſults of the labours of a ſcientific obſerver of the manners and cuſtoms of uncivilized people. No one can proceed far in the ſtudy of the travels of the ordinary miſſionary or explorer without feeling that too often their contributions to ſcience are marred by a want of knowledge of ſome of the principles of anthropology. This ignorance has its advantages, of courſe, in the genuineneſs of the ſimple narrative of an obſerver; but occaſionally one loſes ſight of this advantage in the impatience cauſed by getting

hold of only half a fact, and knowing that the other half ought to have been told too, and that now it is too late to recover it. But neither of theſe conſiderations affect the important work of Meſſrs. Fiſon and Howitt, on the "Kamilaroi and Kurnai," from which I take the following evidence of the group-act of primitive marriage. I tranſcribe the whole account, becauſe it ſeems to anſwer all requirements of this branch of my ſubject, without one word of explanation or commentary from me :—

"Marriage is communal. Every Kumite is theoretically the huſband of every Krokigor in the ſame generation as himſelf. Every Kroki is theoretically the huſband of every Kumitegor in his own generation. It is not hereby aſſerted that marital rights are actually exerciſed to this extent at the preſent day; but they exiſt, and are acknowledged, even now-a-days, to a certain extent. Relationſhip is conſequently that of groups of individuals to other groups. All Kumites and Kumitegors of the ſame generation are looked upon as brothers and ſiſters. So, alſo, are all Krokis and Krokigors of the ſame generation. Every Kumite is looked upon as joint father to all Krokis and Krokigors in the generation next below his own. So, alſo, with the other relationſhips. The regulation given above is the ancient rule. Preſent uſage is that every Kumite, for inſtance, takes as many Krokigor wives as he can get and keep; but the old rule makes itſelf felt ſtill, aſſerting the tribal right in the women, who are now, nominally at

leaſt, the property of the individual. Thus, among tribes which are organized like the Kamilaroi, friendly viſitors from other tribes are accommodated with temporary wives from the proper claſſes, and no man can refuſe to furniſh his quota from his own harem. This ſeems to be the moſt extenſive ſyſtem of communal marriage the world has ever known. It could have held its own in no other part of the globe; for nowhere elſe, if we except an iſolated tribe here and there, have the aborigines been ſo completely ſhut out from external impulſe. Auſtralian marriage—taking into account, for the preſent, thoſe tribes only which have the Kamilaroi organization—is ſomething more than the marriage of group to group within a tribe: it is an arrangement extending acroſs a continent, which divides many widely-ſcattered tribes into intermarrying claſſes, and gives a man of one claſs marital rights over women of another claſs in a tribe a thouſand miles away, and ſpeaking a language other than his own. That relationſhip is of group to group ſeems to be a fair inference from what has already been ſhown as to communal marital rights. As to both marriage and relationſhip, it is the group alone that is regarded. The individual is ignored. He is not looked upon as a perfect entity. He has no exiſtence ſave as a part of a group, which, in its entirety, is the perfect entity. It is not the individual Kumite who marries the individual Krokigor: it is the group of males called Kumite which marries the group of females called Krokigor. Hence the ſon of this marriage is not the individual Kroki, but the

group Kroki: its daughter is not the individual Krokigor, but the group Krokigor. This ſon and this daughter—*i.e.*, group Kroki and group Krokigor—are brother and ſiſter, and this relationſhip binds every member of the groups. So, alſo, with the other degrees." [1]

Nothing could be clearer than ſuch evidence as this. Still there is ſomething of the kind to be found elſewhere, and that, too, from authors who did not have the ſcientific guidance that aſſiſted Meſſrs. Fiſon and Howitt's reſearches. Ariſtotle ſays that ſome tribes of Upper Africa have their wives in common, but yet their children are diſtinguiſhed by their likeneſs to their parents.[2] There are the Naſamonians, mentioned by Herodotus (iv. 172), and the Auſeans (*ib.* 180), and the Agathyrſi (*ib.* 104). "The Agathyrſi have their women in common, that ſo they may be all brothers, and, in virtue of their relationſhip, they may be free from all envy and mutual hatred." Pliny relates the ſame of the Garamantes ("Hiſt. Nat.," v. 8).

The Peruvians could not ſelect their own wives. This was done for them by the Government. So alſo with the Maori: the wife is choſen by the Runanga, or council of the place, without the parties having anything to do with it, beyond giving their conſent.[3] "In Ceylon," ſays a writer in

[1] "Kamilaroi and Kurnai," by Fiſon and Howitt, pp. 51-57. See alſo Farrer's "Primitive Manners and Cuſtoms," p. 222.

[2] "Politics," bk. ii., cap. iii.

[3] Taylor's "Te Ika a Maui; or, New Zealand," i., p. 43.

"Aſiatic Reſearches," "a whole family goes in a body to aſk a girl in marriage; the more numerous the family, the greater title it has to the girl. It is the whole family that marries; conſequently the children belong to the whole family, in the ſame way as the lands, which are never divided."[1] Among the Andamaners (ſays Sir John Lubbock), any woman who attempted to reſiſt the marital privileges claimed by any member of the tribe was liable to ſevere puniſhment.[2]

Theſe are ſome examples of the evidence as to the communal ſtage of primitive marriage. The ſame kind of evidence is to be obtained from the cuſtom of the Aſhimadek clans, whereby every infant is ſuckled by turn by every nurſing-mother of the clan.[3] Another very ſignificant cuſtom, ſhowing how clearly the marriage is a marriage, not to individuals, but to the houſe-group, is to be found among the weſtern Kunnuvers, one of the hill tribes of the Piney Hills of India. In the caſe of an eſtate devolving on a female, which is likely to occur from the default of male iſſue, ſhe is prohibited marriage, but undergoes the ceremony of being betrothed to ſome part of the dwelling. She is, however, allowed to have offspring by one of the tribe, and upon him, if a male, the eſtate devolves.[4]

We now come to the ſecond, or, as I have called it, the marital ſtage. We do not get direct evidence

[1] "Aſiatic Reſearches," vii., p. 425.
[2] "Origin of Civilization," p. 105.
[3] Biddulph's "Tribes of the Hindoo Kooſh," p. 83.
[4] "Journal of Aſiatic Society of Bengal," 1835, iv., p. 665.

of the group-act here, but it is repreſented by many ſignificant cuſtoms, which ſhow that when ſociety had advanced far enough to proclaim that the wife ceaſed to be the common property of the tribe, her equivalent in money or cattle, her rights and privileges, were ſtill conſidered the common property of the tribe. Among the Ahts of Vancouver's Iſland, the purchaſe of wives is made in public, and great ceremony is obſerved when a chief's wife is purchaſed. Grave tribal diſcuſſions as to the purchaſe-money, the ſuitableneſs of rank, and all the benefits likely to follow, accompany any ſuch propoſal of marriage. On the heralds or criers giving notice that diſtinguiſhed viſitors are at hand, every perſon in a native encampment comes out, and ſquats down, covered with a blanket to the chin. On the queſtion being aſked where the viſitors are from, and what is wanted, a ſpeaker riſes in one of the canoes, and addreſſes the natives on ſhore in a loud voice. He gives the name, titles, and hiſtory of the expectant huſband. At the end of the ſpeech, a canoe is paddled to the beach, and a bundle of blankets is thrown on land. Contemptuous laughter follows from the friends of the woman; and thus, with ſpeeches and additional gifts, many hours are occupied, until finally the woman is brought down to the ſhore, ſtripped to her ſhift, and delivered to her lover.[1]

In South Africa, when a young woman is about to be married, ſhe is placed in a hut alone, and anointed with various unguents, and many incanta-

[1] Sproat's "Scenes and Studies of Savage Life," pp. 100, 101.

tions are employed, in order to ſecure good fortune and fruitfulneſs. Here, as almoſt everywhere in the South, the height of good fortune is to bear ſons. They often leave a huſband altogether if they have daughters only. After ſome days, the bride elect is taken to another hut, and adorned with all the richeſt clothing and ornaments that the relatives can either lend or borrow. She is then placed in a public ſituation, ſaluted as a lady, and preſents made by all her acquaintances are placed around her. After this ſhe is taken to the reſidence of her huſband, where ſhe has a hut for herſelf, and becomes one of ſeveral wives. Dancing, feaſting, and drinking on ſuch occaſions are prolonged for ſeveral days. In caſes of ſeparation, the woman returns to her father's family, and the huſband receives back what he gave for her.[1]

Feaſting generally accompanies every Malagaſy marriage. When the preliminaries are determined and a good or lucky day fixed, the relatives of the bride and bridegroom meet at the houſes of the parents of the reſpective parties. The relatives or friends of the bridegroom accompany him to the houſe of the bride. They pay or receive the dowry, which being ſettled, he is welcomed by the bride as her future huſband; they eat together, are recognized by the ſenior members of the family as huſband and wife, a benediction is pronounced upon them. . . They then repair to the houſe of the bridegroom and again eat together, ſimilar benedictions are pronounced over them by the ſenior

[1] Livingſtone's "South Africa," p. 412.

members of the family or the head man of the village, who is uſually invited to the ceremony. If, as is generally the caſe, the houſes in which the parties have met is below the hill on which the village is built, the bride is placed on a ſort of chair under a canopy, and borne on the ſhoulders of men up the ſides of the hill to the centre of the village. Occaſionally the bridegroom is carried in the ſame manner. The relatives and friends follow in proceſſion, clapping their hands and ſinging as the bearers aſcend. On reaching the village they halt at what is called the parent-houſe, or reſidence of the officer of the government; a haſina, or piece of money, is given to the attending officer for the Sovereign, the receiving of which is conſidered a legal official ratification of the engagement.[1]

I take theſe examples to be typical of the group-act. Clearly all have a right to take part in the ceremony, and although this right loſes ſomething of its legal aſpect in its ſocial bearings, the feaſting and its accompanying joyouſneſs cannot quite hide the group-act. On arriving at the third ſtage of the development of marriage cuſtoms, where the group-act may be found to have ſurvived in the village-act of modern ſociety, we find ourſelves met at the very beginning by curious and, I think, complete evidence.

But here we may aſk, How does Engliſh cuſtom coincide with this ſtate of things? We approach the anſwer through the medium of a cuſtom of the New Mexicans. Bancroft relates of them

[1] Ellis's "Hiſtory of Madagaſcar," i., pp. 166, 167.

that among the laws particularly deſerving of mention is one according to which no one can ſell or marry out of the town until he obtains permiſſion from the authorities.[1] Now ſubſtituting for this the facts of Engliſh village-life and its long proceſs of development from the village community, and we come back to exactly the ſame ſtate of things. The lord of the manor in England has in moſt inſtances aggregated to himſelf the functions of the old village authorities, and from this I cannot but think we have the origin of the lord's ſanction to his tenant's marriage in feudal times. The proceſs of development is unqueſtionably difficult to trace back, but looking at the whole queſtion by the light which comparative juriſprudence ſheds upon our village hiſtory, we then perceive the difficulties vaniſh.

The ſubject is important enough to look at a little cloſely. From ſome intereſting papers in the "Law Magazine and Review" (vol. xiv.), on the rights, diſabilities, and uſages of the ancient Engliſh peaſantry, I have collected ſome very ſignificant

[1] "Native Races of America," i., p. 547. Pritchard ("Phyſical Hiſt. of Man," ii., p. 92) gives us another form of this ſtate of things:—"The king of Dahomeh has a monopoly of all the women of his empire: a ſubject can only obtain a wife by the bounty of his Sovereign, to conciliate which he muſt make a largeſs of 20,000 cowries, and in conformity with the ancient African cuſtom muſt, beſides, roll himſelf in the duſt before the gate of the royal palace. All newly-born children belong to the king as the offspring of a flock to the proprietary of the ſoil. Children are taken from their parents, and receive a kind of public education."

evidence of my interpretation of the village marriage. At Swincombe, in Oxfordſhire, the bondman could not get a huſband for his daughter, and could not take to himſelf a wife without the lord's permiſſion. This is the ordinary feudal form, but although this may be conſidered but meagre evidence of primitive life, there are other cuſtoms which by analogy take us to the times we are dealing with. At Southfleet, Frindſbury, Wouldham, and other places in their neighbourhood, we are told, a tenant who wiſhed to give his daughter in marriage had to announce the marriage to the warden or bailiff of the village, and to invite him to the wedding; the girl could not be married to anyone out of the manor without the lord's goodwill; an heireſs could not be married even to a neighbour without the lord's conſent. A tenant at Haddington paid no fine on the marriage of his daughter within the manor, but he paid two ſhillings for leave to give her in marriage to a ſtranger (p. 36). Is not this legalized folk-lore? At all events, is it not feudalized primitive cuſtom? It is important to note that the fine is always paid by the bride's father or the perſon who ſtood in the place of her father. All theſe belong to the department of marriage cuſtoms, juſt as much as the popular cuſtoms we ſhall note further on, the only difference being that in theſe caſes the lord who took upon himſelf the poſition of village authority found it an advantage to retain the cuſtoms as his right, whereas other cuſtoms have been retained by the villagers as a part of their ſocial enjoyments.

Well, then, we are now face to face with the marriage ceremony in England as a relic of an ancient group-act, as a relic, that is, of early village life, and not as a matter of family or perſonal intereſt irreſpective of the claims of fellow-villagers. We have, I think, already eſtabliſhed the initial evidence by identifying the ſanction of the manorial lord with the ſanction of the early village authorities, this ſanction pre-ſuppoſing a property in the women of the village. We muſt now travel beyond this ſtage to ſome cuſtoms that have never become a part of the manorial law, but have always remained with the village, unſanctioned, of courſe, but ſtill kept up by the perſiſtence of popular adherence to old manners and cuſtoms.

Always bearing in mind the original group-origin of marriage cuſtoms, we come firſt upon the ceremony of bride-capture, ſo well known to ſavage ſociety. Mr. McLennan, it is well known, traces the cuſtom to the primitive law that prevented men marrying women of their own tribe, and ſo compelled them to capture wives from other tribes. But be this as it may, the practice of bride-capture is a communal action, not a perſonal one, nor a family one. In almoſt all caſes (ſays Mr. McLennan) the form of capture is the ſymbol of a group-act, of a ſiege or pitched battle, or an invaſion of a houſe by an armed band. On the one ſide are the kindred of the huſband, on the other the kindred of the wife.[1] As civilization progreſſes the kindred of both huſband and wife belong to the ſame village,

[1] "Primitive Marriage," pp. 444-5.

and the capture is reduced from actual fact to a mere ceremony, but ſtill the original communal action is kept up. There is no occaſion, of courſe, to go through the extraordinary caſes of bride-capture to be met with in all parts of the world—they have been collected and commented upon by Mr. McLennan, Sir John Lubbock, and Mr. J. H. Farrer. And ſo, without ſtopping at all to relate the ſavage cuſtoms, we at once paſs to Engliſh examples. They are here repreſented only as the ſurvival of the primitive village ceremony. We ſee the village in its group-aſpect taking the part of bride or bridegroom, and I ſhall be able to relate ſome peculiar relics of this diſtinctly village ceremony.

Let us firſt of all ſee the ceremony of bride-capture itſelf. Sir Henry Piers ſays, "In the Iriſh marriages, eſpecially in thoſe countries where cattle abound, the parents and friends on each ſide meet on the ſide of a hill, or, if the weather be cold, in ſome place of ſhelter, about midway between both dwellings. If agreement enſue, they drink the agreement bottle, as they call it, which is a bottle of good uſquebaugh, and this goes merrily round. For payment of the portion—which is generally a determinate number of cows—little care is taken. The father or next of kin to the bride ſends to his neighbours and friends *ſub mutuæ viciſſitudinis obtentu*, and every one gives his cow or heifer, and thus the portion is quickly paid. Nevertheleſs, caution is taken from the bridegroom on the day of delivery for reſtitution of the cattle, in caſe the bride die

childleſs within a certain day, limited by agreement; and in this caſe every man's own beaſt is reſtored. Thus care is taken that no man ſhall grow rich by frequent marriages. On the day of bringing home, the bridegroom and his friends ride out and meet the bride and her friends at the place of meeting. Being come near each other, the cuſtom was of old to caſt ſhort darts at the company that attended the bride, but at ſuch diſtance that ſeldom any hurt enſued. Yet it is not out of the memory of man that the Lord of Hoath, on ſuch an occaſion, loſt an eye." [1]

Then from Wales we have this form of the cuſtom. "The bridegroom, on the morning of the wedding, accompanied with a troop of his friends, as well equipped as the country will allow, comes and demands the bride. Her friends, who are likewiſe well mounted on their merlins (the Welſh name for a little mountain horſe), give a poſitive refuſal to their demands, whereupon a mock ſcuffle enſues between the parties. The bride is mounted on one of the beſt ſteeds behind her next kinſman, who rides away with her in full career. The bridegroom and his friends purſue them with loud ſhouts. It is not uncommon to ſee on ſuch an occaſion, two or three hundred of theſe merlins, mounted by ſturdy Cambro-Britons, riding with full ſpeed, croſſing and joſtling each other, to the

[1] Vallency's "Collectanea de Rebus Hibernicis," i., p. 122, 1786, No. 1, "Deſcription of Weſtmeath," by Sir Henry Piers, written A.D. 1682, quoted in McLennan's "Primitive Marriage," pp. 314-5.

no ſmall amuſement of the ſpectators. When they have pretty well fatigued themſelves and their horſes, the bridegroom is permitted to overtake his bride. He leads her away in triumph, as the Romans did the Sabine nymphs. They all return in amity, and the whole is concluded with feſtivity and mirth."[1]

Theſe inſtances are tolerably complete in their general outline—the ceremony of bride-capture being unqueſtionably a part of the marriage feſtival, and the village aſpect of the whole ceremony being ſtrongly inſtanced. We will now turn to ſome leſs diſtinctive forms of bride capture, where it is repreſented by ſome ſymbolic act of contention between the two parties, where the original form, in fact, has been influenced by civilized cuſtom and has thus undergone development.

The northern counties of England have (ſays Mr. Henderſon) ſome excluſively local wedding cuſtoms. A wedding in the Dales of Yorkſhire is indeed a thing to ſee; nothing can be imagined comparable to it in wildneſs and obſtreperous mirth. The bride and bridegroom may poſſibly be a little ſubdued, but his friends are like men bereft of reaſon. They career round the bridal party like Arabs of the deſert, galloping over ground on which, in cooler moments, they would heſitate even to walk a horſe —ſhouting all the time, and firing volleys from the guns they carry with them. Next they will daſh along the road in advance of the party, carrying the whiſky-bottle, and compelling everyone they

[1] "Letters from Snowdon" [anonymous], 1770.

meet to pledge the newly-married pair. In the higher parts of Northumberland as well as on the other ſide of the Border the ſcene is, if poſſible, ſtill more wild. In Northumberland the men of the party all ſtart off from the church door on horſe-back, galloping like madmen through moſs and over moor, till they reach the place where the wedding breakfaſt is to be held, and he who arrives firſt may claim a kiſs of the bride. Such a wedding is called "a riding wedding," and the race to the young couple's new home after the marriage "running the braiſe, or brooze." In rural parts, too, of the county of Durham, the bridal party is eſcorted to church by men armed with guns, which they fire again and again cloſe to the ears of bride and brideſmaids, terrifying them ſometimes not a little. At Guiſborough, in Cleveland, theſe guns are fired over the heads of the newly-married couple all the way from church.[1]

The cuſtoms in Scotland, as related by Mr. Gregor, are full of intereſt.

Two men, called the *ſens*, were deſpatched from the houſe of the bridegroom to demand the bride. On making their appearance a volley of fire-arms met them. When they came up to the door of the bride's home they aſked,

"Does —— bide here?"

"Aye, faht de ye wint wee ir?"

"We wint ir for ——," was the anſwer.

"Bit ye winna get ir."

"But we'll tack ir."

[1] Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties," p. 37.

"Will ye come in, an taſte a moofu o' a dram till we ſee aboot it?"

And ſo the *ſens* entered the houſe, and got poſſeſſion of the bride.

Both parties arranged their departure from their reſpective homes in ſuch a way as to arrive at church about the ſame time—the bride's party always having the preference. Each party was accompanied by pipers, and a conſtant firing of guns and piſtols was kept up.

After the ceremony at the church, the proceſſion was again formed, led by the bride, ſupported by the two *ſens*. Then followed the bridegroom, ſupported by the bride's two beſt maidens; and with muſic and the firing of guns and piſtols the two parties, now united, marched along the ordinary road to the home of the bridegroom.[1]

This firing of guns as a ſurvival of actual fighting is alſo to be met with in primitive ſociety. Among the Dards of India when the bridegroom has to go for his bride to a diſtant village he is furniſhed with a bow. On arriving at his native place he croſſes the breaſt of his bride with an arrow and then ſhoots it off. He generally ſhoots three arrows off in the direction of his home. At Aſtor the cuſtom is ſometimes to fire guns as a ſign of rejoicing.[2]

In Mr. Napier's "Folk-Lore in the Weſt of Scotland," we have the following variation of the cuſtom:—

[1] Gregor's "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," pp. 91-2.

[2] "Indian Antiquary," i., p. 12.

"There were two companies, the bride's party and the bridegroom's party. The bride's party met in the bride's parents' houſe, the beſt man being with them. . . . . At the time appointed the bride's party left firſt, followed immediately by the groom's party. . . . . On coming within a mile or ſo of the young couple's houſe, where the mother of the young goodman was waiting, a few of the young men would ſtart on a race home. This race was often keenly conteſted, and was termed *running the brooze* or *braize*. The one who reached the houſe firſt and announced the happy completion of the wedding, was preſented with a bottle of whiſkey and a glaſs. . . . . The beſt man went with the bride to the miniſter. His duty was to take charge of the bride and hand her over to the bridegroom. In this now obſolete cuſtom, I think we may find a ſtill further proof that the management and cuſtoms of the marriage proceſſion were founded on the old practice of wife-capture. The beſt man is evidently juſt the bridegroom's friend, who, in the abſence of the bridegroom, undertakes to protect the bride againſt a raid until ſhe reaches the church, when he hands her over to his friend the bridegroom" (pages 48, 49, 51).

Sir W. Scott, in deſcribing the marriage of Lucy Aſhton, probably alludes to the cuſtom of protecting the bride in the following ſpeech of the boy bride's-man, Henry Aſhton:—"I am to be bride's-man, and ride before you to the kirk, and all our kith, kin, and allies, and all Bucklaw's are to be mounted and in order, and I am to have a . . . . ſword-belt

. . . . and a dagger." I may add to this the mention of "the diſcharge of piſtols, guns, and muſketoons, to give what was called the bridal ſhot" immediately after the ceremony.[1]

Beſt, in his "Rural Economy in Yorkſhire in 1641" (Surtees Society), devotes a chapter to "Concerninge our Faſhions att our Country Weddinges," and ſays: "Soe ſoone as the bride is tyred, and that they are ready to goe forth, the bridegroome comes and takes her by the hand, and ſayth, 'Miſtris, I hope you are willinge,' or elſe kiſſeth her before them, and then followeth her father out of the doores; then one of the bridegroome his men, uſhereth the bride, and goes foremoſt . . . The bridegroome and the bride's brothers or freinds tende att dinner; hee perhapps fetcheth her hoame to his howſe aboute a moneth after, and the portion is paide that morninge that ſhe goes away. When the younge man comes to fetch away his bride, ſome of his beſt freinds, and younge men his neighbours, come alonge with him, and others perhaps meete them in the way" (page 117).

Reverting to what has been ſaid about the ſavage cuſtom of bride capture—that it is diſtinctively a group-act—I think there cannot be any doubt that the group-act of ſavage ſociety has here ſurvived in the village-act of Engliſh ſociety. I ſhall give ſome further inſtances of the village nature of the marriage cuſtoms of England, but I think none are ſo perfect as theſe bride-capture examples; alike by their nature and by their permanence in Engliſh

[1] "Bride of Lammermoor," cap. xxvi.

cuſtom they illuſtrate forcibly what we have been all along trying to eſtabliſh, that Engliſh folk-lore carries us back by ſure lines to the primitive village-life of our anceſtors.

Coming a ſtep nearer to more general cuſtoms, we ſtill ſee diſtinctly aſſerted the village aſpect of the archaic marriage ceremony. Take, for inſtance, the invitations to the wedding feſtival. Among the tribes of Northern India, on the day before the marriage every houſehold in the valley is aſked, and as the ſun ſets at leaſt one man and woman from every houſe muſt appear, elſe it will be preſumed that ſome deadly hatred parts the families.[1] Is not this the equivalent of the group-act? All the villagers, or at all events the repreſentatives of every houſe, are bound to attend, and this binding attendance at the village marriage tells us equally with bride capture and manorial ſanction that the village exerciſed its old group-act long after the houſe-religion had encroached upon it, and had declared ſome ſort of individual ownerſhip in the homeſtead as againſt communal ownerſhip in the village. Let me give an inſtance of this wide and general aſſembling of the village from other than Aryan people. The number of gueſts preſent at the marriage feſtivities of the Kaffirs is ſometimes very great. At the marriage of chiefs of high rank, they amount to thouſands. On ſuch occaſions the greater portion of the tribe aſſembles, and all the other chiefs within one or two days' journey are expected either to attend in perſon, or ſend their racing oxen. To

[1] Gover's "Folk Songs of Southern India," p. 125.

neglect to do either would be conſidered an affront. The bridegroom and his friends provide the ſlaughter cattle for the feaſt; but the gueſts bring their own milch cows and milkſacks. From four or five to fifty head of cattle are ſlaughtered, according to the wealth and rank of the parties.[1]

In Scotland we meet with diſtinct evidence of this aſſembly of the whole village, and it may be preſumed that it is not, as a rule, ſpecially mentioned by the collectors of folk-lore, becauſe it apparently had not much to do with the queſtion. However, Mr. Gregor's example is ſufficiently ſtrong to bear out the parallel to the cuſtoms juſt noted in primitive ſociety.

"On an evening ſhortly before the marriage day, or on the evening before the marriage, the bride and bridegroom ſet out in company, often hand in hand, to invite the gueſts. The bridegroom carries a piece of chalk, and if he find the door of any of his friends' houſes ſhut, he makes a croſs on it with his chalk. This mark is underſtood as an invitation to the marriage. A common form of words in giving the invitation is: "Ye ken faht's adee the morn at twal o'clock. Come our, an feſs a' yir ooſe wi ye," or, "Come ane, come athegeethir." The number of gueſts is uſually large, ranging from forty to a hundred or a hundred and twenty. On the morning of the marriage day, the bride, after being decked in bridal array, goes the round of her own friends in company with her 'beſt maid,' and repeats her invitation to ſuch as ſhe wiſhes to be of

[1] Maclean's "Kaffir Laws and Cuſtoms," p. 51.

her party. The bridegroom, accompanied by his 'beſt man,' does the ſame, and repeats his invitation to thoſe he wiſhes to be of his party."[1]

In Weſtmoreland, and probably the whole north of England, it was uſual to invite all the country, far and near, to theſe Bridewains or bidden weddings; and at the appointed time preparations were made for a general feaſt. Each of the company gave ſomething to the bride, who ſat with a plate upon her knee to receive the company. After the marriage ceremony they all mounted their horſes and had a race for a ribbon and a pair of gloves.[2]

Jollie, in his "Manners and Cuſtoms of Cumberland," publiſhed in 1811, relates almoſt the ſame facts, the friends of the bride and bridegroom, and "often their neighbours" being invited to the wedding.[3]

In Ireland a houſe with three contiguous compartments is ſelected for a wedding; the reaſon of this is to preſerve a diſtinction between the claſſes of company expected. The beſt apartment is reſerved for the bride and bridegroom, the prieſt and piper, and the more opulent and reſpectable gueſts, as the landlord, his family, and the neighbouring gentry, who are always invited, and generally attend on theſe occaſions. The ſecond apartment is appropriated for the neighbours in general; and the third,

[1] Gregor's "Folk-Lore of North-Eaſt of Scotland," pp. 97, 98.

[2] Hampſon's "Medii Ævi Kalend.," p. 289.

[3] See Jollie's "Manners," &c., pp. 39, 40.

or an outhouſe, is devoted to the reception of buck-haughs, ſhulers, and other beggars.[1]

To this ſame cuſtom of inviting all the community to be preſent, can be referred the origin of our church appeal to the congregation upon giving out the banns of marriage for the aſcertainment of any juſt cauſe or impediment againſt the marriage. The voice of the primitive community here ſpeaks through its modern repreſentative. A cuſtom in St. Kilda illuſtrates this.

"In St. Kilda," ſays Martin, "when any two of them have agreed to take one another for man and wife, the officer who preſides over them ſummons all the inhabitants of both ſexes to Chriſt's Chapel, where being aſſembled, he inquires publicly if there be any lawful impediment why theſe parties ſhould not be joined in the bond of matrimony? And if there be no objection to the contrary, he then inquires of the parties if they are reſolved to live together in weal and woe, &c.?"[2] This ceremony is here performed under the village officer—a fact which indicates the ancient village right now transferred to the church.

Then we have parallel inſtances of the circuit of the village being made, in Scotland, Ruſſia, and Southern India; and this, again, is a relic of the group-act.

In one, if not more, of the villages, ſays Mr. Gregor, when the marriage takes place in the home of the bride, after the rite is concluded, the whole

[1] Croker's "Reſearches in the South of Ireland," p. 235.

[2] Pinkerton, iii., p. 717.

of the marriage party makes the circuit of the village.[1]

In Ruſſia, too, it may be mentioned that the bride is accuſtomed to go the round of the village with a woman who calls for the ſympathy of her hearers for the young girl, whoſe care-free exiſtence is about to be exchanged for the troubles and anxieties of married life,[2] and the key-note ſeems to me to be ſupplied from South-Eaſtern Ruſſia, where, on the eve of marriage, the bride goes the round of the village, throwing herſelf on her knees before the head of each houſe, and begging his pardon.[3] The Indian cuſtom is as follows :—

The "*divendra vimânan*," or covered car, is invariably uſed in marriage ceremonies as the peculiar vehicle for the conveyance of the bride and bridegroom around the village. The traditions record that the people emigrated five centuries ago in theſe "*divendra vimânan*."[4]

Laſtly, there is the cuſtom of holding great aſſemblies of ſports and games at weddings, which again brings the marriage ceremony within the category of a village inſtitution. Brand gives plenty of examples of this, but the beſt example comes from Ireland, where it is connected with another curious cuſtom. In King's County, Young records that it was the cuſtom for a number of country neighbours, among the poor people, to fix upon

[1] Gregor's "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," p. 98.

[2] Quoted in Farrer's "Primitive Manners and Cuſtoms," p. 197.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 200.

[4] "Indian Antiq.," iii., p. 289.

ſome young woman that ought, as they think, to be married; they alſo agree upon a young fellow as a proper huſband for her; this determined, they ſend to the fair one's cabin to inform her that on the Sunday following "ſhe is to be horſed," that is, carried on men's backs.[1] She muſt then provide whiſky and cider for a treat, as all will pay her a viſit after maſs for a hurling match. As ſoon as ſhe is horſed the hurling begins, in which the young fellow appointed for her huſband has the eyes of all the company fixed upon him. If he comes off conqueror, he is certainly married to the girl; but if another is victorious, he as certainly loſes her, for ſhe is the prize of the victor. Theſe trials are not always finiſhed in one Sunday, they take ſometimes two or three, and the common expreſſion when they are over is, that "ſuch a girl was goal'd." Sometimes one barony will hurl against another, but a marriageable girl is always the prize.[2] The peculiar ſignificance of the marriage being initiated by the "neighbours" and not by the two lovers is very remarkable.

One other important feature of the primitive village marriage muſt be mentioned, the marriage gift. On the occaſion of a wedding in Lancaſhire, each gueſt either ſent or preſented ſome offering of money or food.[3] In this is to be recognized the common meal, ſo important an item of primitive ſociety, as

[1] This cuſtom is to be met with among the North American Indians. See "American Ethnology," iii., 354.

[2] Pinkerton, iii., p. 860.

[3] Harland and Wilkinſon's "Lancaſhire Folk-Lore," p. 264.

we have already ſeen. In a previous chapter it has been noted how the community at large built the houſe for the newly-married couple; and, in addition to theſe acts of the community, ſo curiouſly and ſignificantly preſerved in modern local cuſtoms, there is the general contribution to the domeſtic neceſſities of the new owners of a homeſtead. The marriage gift, as known to the higher grades of ſociety, has little in common, perhaps, with the primitive original from which it is derived; but if we turn, as folk-lore always bids us turn, to the poor and to the outlying diſtricts of our iſland-home, we find the clue to this primitive original. There are many examples known to folk-lore where the bride and bridegroom begin life upon the accumulated contributions of fellow-villagers. Already from the Iriſh example quoted above from Sir Henry Piers we have ſome evidence of this; but, perhaps, one of the moſt curious examples and one moſt perfect in detail is that ſupplied from an old journal of the time of Charles II., extracts from which have been printed in Tranſactions of the Kilkenny Archæological Society. I quote the following *verbatim et literatim*:—

"The very better ſort of old Iriſh that are under ſome cloud or indeed in tolerable good condition are wont upon the matching of a daughter, in order to it, to go up and down and beg for a twelvemonth beforehand after this manner to rayſe her porcõn.

"1°. The perſon to be married, ſometimes her mother, wth her a ſort of gentlewoman, a ſpeaker,

two to drive the cattle, and a waiting mayde, hard to be diſtinguiſhed from her miſtreſs with a draggled tayle, theſe all enter the houſe, ſitt down on the ſtooles and benches according to their diſtinctions without uttering one word for above an hour or two. Then the attendant ſpeaker riſeth and after a ſalute or honour made, he or ſhe after a ſhort introductiõ by the way of a ſpeache deſire a Coonagh ſprea, which being interpreted is an help for a porcõn, viz. ſomething to bring about a marriage. So lately a perſon of quality, but not of condition gott for her daughter ſeven or eight ſcore collops (head of cattle ſo called), the vulgar are afrayd to deny and give each a cow or yearling, calf, ſheep, or the like. The ſcullogues or comõn ſort alſo mump, but not with the ſame formality and procure ſheep, lambs, piggs, geeſe, turkeys, &c. Yett with them a marriage is never compleated untill they have an iron pott, gridiron, hutch, an Iriſh cheſt ſo called, and a caddow or rugg or blankett. The giving of ten ſhillings Engliſh anſwers a collop." [1]

To conclude the intereſting and inſtructive ſubject of marriage ceremonies, I will note ſome analogies between ſavage and Engliſh cuſtoms which cannot be grouped under the headings already given; they repreſent the ſtraggling ſcraps of the primitive village cuſtoms which have come down to us without any definite place in the group-act.

Among the Bajantri Korawa, in marrying, at the hour pronounced to be fortunate, the bride and bride-

[1] "Kilkenny Arch. Soc.," i. (N.S.), pp. 183, 184.

groom ſmeared with turmeric are ſeated on the ground, and a circle drawn with rice around them. For five days the muſicians attend before the door, and the whole concludes by the neighbours gathering round and ſprinkling a few grains from the rice circle over the couple.[1]

I have particularly recorded this curious cuſtom becauſe Mr. Lang, in mentioning the cuſtom of the ancient Greeks daubing their naked bodies with clay and dirt in the Dionyſiac myſteries, quotes a cuſtom from Auſtralia and Africa very ſimilar to the Greek, and then obſerves :—"Will any one ſay that the dirty practice of the Greeks was an invention of their own civilization, and that black fellows and negroes retain this, and not much elſe, from a culture which they once ſhared with Aryans? Or is it not more probable that a rite, originally ſavage, was not diſcarded by the Greeks as they paſſed from ſavagery to civilization? This example has not, to my knowledge, any counterpart in modern folk-lore."[2] Aſking exactly the ſame queſtions about the daubing of the bridegroom among the migratory tribes of Central India, I will add the counterpart in modern folk-lore.

On the evening before the marriage, ſays Mr. Gregor, there was the "feet-waſhing." A few of the bridegroom's moſt intimate friends aſſembled at his houſe, when a large tub was brought forward and nearly filled with water. The bridegroom was

[1] "Journal Aſiatic Soc. of Bengal" (Migratory Tribes of Central India), xiii., pt. i., p. 10.

[2] Preface to "Folk-Lore Record," ii.

ſtripped of ſhoes and ſtockings, and his feet and legs were plunged in the water. One ſeized a beſom, and began to rub them luſtily, while another was buſy beſmearing them with ſoot or ſhoe-blacking, and a third was practiſing ſome other vagary.[1] If the waſhing of feet is to be conſidered, there are many parallels, one of which I may perhaps mention. Among the Koragars the bride and bridegroom take a cold water bath.[2]

The Afghans have a cuſtom, common in Wales, where it is called "bundling." The Afghans call it "Namzad bazee," or "betrothal game."[3]

It was formerly a cuſtom obſerved both in France and England for the man to give the woman he eſpouſed a betrothing-penny as earneſt-money of her purchaſe. One of theſe ſmall pieces of ſilver is figured in the "Archæologia" (vol. xvii., p. 124). It is inſcribed with the words "*Denirs de foy pour epouſer;*" and on one ſide is engraved a heart between two hands, and on the other two *fleurs de lis*. This appears ſomething like the bride-price of ancient ſociety. But without going into this wide-ſpread cuſtom, the form of it above mentioned is to be found elſewhere than in England. Among the Coorgs the bride being led in to her father's kitchen and placed upon a chair, the bridegroom, among other ceremonies, "gives her a little money."[4] Among the Koragars alſo many cuſtoms

[1] "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," p. 90.
[2] "Indian Antiq.," iii., 196.
[3] "Journ. Aſiatic Soc., Bengal," xiv., p. 447.
[4] Gover's "Folk Songs of Southern India," p. 127.

are ſimilar, and the bridegroom gives the bride "two ſilver pieces."[1]

It is cuſtomary at a marriage in South China for the bride to preſent her huſband with a pair of ſhoes. Now, in a work publiſhed in 1640 (England), mention is made of an ancient cuſtom, "when at any time a couple were married the ſole of the bridegroom's ſhoe was laid on the bride's head,"[2] and no doubt the gift and the action embody a ſimilar idea—the power of the huſband.

In China marriages are forbidden between people of the ſame family-name, and the ſame idea is expreſſed in old rhyme :—

> "If you change the name and not the letter,
> You change for the worſe and not for the better."[3]

I now wiſh to gather up the various cuſtoms with which we have been dealing in their ſeparate ſtate, and ſee if there is not ſome hiſtorical anſwer to the queſtion—how do we know that theſe items, now ſcattered over many different diſtricts in all parts of the Britiſh Iſles, may be grouped together as relics of an original village marriage? It may be ſaid that the inſtances of bride capture do not fit in with the inſtances of invitation to the whole village, with the parade round the village, with the marriage gifts, and ſo on—that if the one has deſcended from the original village ceremony, the others muſt have been

[1] "Indian Antiquary," iii., p. 196.

[2] Dennys' "Folk-Lore of China," p. 18. See Thrupp's "Anglo-Saxon Home," pp. 51, 52.

[3] Dennys' "Folk-Lore of China," p. 19, and Henderſon's "Folk-Lore of the North-Eaſt of Scotland," p. 41.

derived from other ſources. But without ſtaying to anſwer theſe propoſitions by any theoretical reſtoration of the village ceremony, I think I can anſwer it at once by an hiſtorical reſtoration. I ſhall have to go to the village of Lorraine for this typical village marriage, but there is no ſcientific objection to this. My propoſition is, in ſhort, that while we have ſucceeded in gathering together many of the loſt features of the village marriage as it once exiſted in England, this reſtoration has left the picture in a ſomewhat patchwork condition. We have not been able to put our finger upon a perfect or very nearly perfect example of the village marriage, but have ſimply gathered up from various iſolated diſtricts many of its moſt eſſential features. But here the right to bind theſe many iſolations together, and to call them a unity, is not given to us from Engliſh folk-lore. Step on to the neighbour-land of France, however, and ſee what we meet with there. It comes to us in the ſhape of a narrative by an eye-witneſs of a rural wedding in Lorraine, the complete record of which I have reprinted in the "Folk-Lore Record," vol. iii., as it appeared in its original form in the "Engliſhwoman's Domeſtic Magazine." This is truly a remarkable ceremony. It gives the real picture of all that has been previouſly ſaid, and places at once in full completeneſs the marriage ceremony as an original village inſtitution—a part of the village politics and as eſſentially a public act of intereſt to all the members of the community as any other branch of the village life. We meet with almoſt all the features I have treated of, and as I

place it in an abridged form in its place here as a relic of the primitive village life of the Aryan world, it will be found to fit in admirably with all that we know of that diſtinctive and ſtrongly vital organization. I will go through the Lorraine example ſtage by ſtage as it is given in the original, and it will ſoon be ſeen how it gathers together many of the iſolated cuſtoms we have been ſpeaking of.

The parents of the bride, their daughter, the bridegroom, and their immediate relatives, proceeded together to give the invitation to neighbours. This was accompliſhed in the following manner:—The father of the bride firſt attached to the mantelpiece a ſprig of laurel, bedecked with blue and ſcarlet ribbons, called *l'exploit*, or letter of invitation; and next he courteouſly handed to each of the houſehold a croſs, compoſed of blue and ſcarlet ribbons, which formed, as it were, the cards of admiſſion, and were to be worn at the marriage by the males at their button-holes and the females in their caps. Then the good man, in ſet terms, ſolicited the pleaſure of the preſence of the maſter and miſtreſs of the houſe, with all their *company*—that is to ſay, all their relations, friends, and ſervants—to the "*benediction, the feaſt, the dance, and all ſubſequent feſtivities;*" but, notwithſtanding the comprehenſiveneſs of this invitation, which is repeated at every decent eſtabliſhment in the village, cuſtom requires that only two individuals of a family ſhall avail themſelves of the bridefather's liberality. All the parties then bowed and curtſied, and retired.

Towards evening, on the day before the marriage,

the bride's mother aſſembled in her houſe three of her neighbouring goſſips, matrons who were rigid conſervators of ancient uſage, of apt memory, and undoubted fluency of diction, ſix or ſeven maidens, and double the number of ſtalwart youths, who formed the body-guard of the bride, with the all-important *Bazoulan.*

When the deſtined defenders of the bride withdrew into the farmhouſe, they forthwith cloſed all the doors and windows, and barricaded every place of entry with drawers, tables, chairs, planks, ſtools, and logs of wood, as if the peaceful dwelling had been an important outpoſt, fortified ſo as to detain an invading force until the arrival of the main body of an army. As ſoon as this was accompliſhed, the diſtant noiſe of ſinging, laughing, firing of guns, and ſhouting, accompanied with ſtirring marches on ſeveral ruſtic inſtruments, announced the approach of the band of the bridegroom, who came in the guiſe of the Paladins of old to win his bride by doughty deeds of arms.

Suddenly the minſtrels ſtruck up a *pas de charge*, the ſtormers poured into the yard with one wild "Hurrah," under cover of a general diſcharge of muſketry; and the ſcene was acted in ſuch an admirable manner that a ſtranger, unaware of the true facts, would have thought the farmhouſe was in real danger from a band of lawleſs, deſperate marauders.

When the oppoſing camps were thus fairly in preſence of each other, a lull took place; and one of the band repreſenting at once, herald, bard, and

ſpokeſman of the bridegroom, came out from the ranks, marched majeſtically with all the pomp and pride of office to the houſe-door, and called a parley, which being granted, the *Bazoulan* aſcended to the loft at the top of the houſe, which is uſed univerſally in French farms as a depôt for grain, and on his opening a ſmall trap for the admiſſion of light in the large door, through which the ſheaves are pitched or hoiſted up, the following dialogue enſued in the quaint patois and antique poetical expreſſions of the country, which it is impoſſible adequately to tranſlate :—

Bridegroom. My good, kind friends, dear fellow pariſhioners and goſſips, open your hoſpitable doors to your poor brethren, preſently in abſolute diſtreſs.

Bazoulan. Who are you, ſirrah, who take the liberty of calling us your fellow pariſhioners? Go thy way, malapert, for we know thee not.

Bridegroom. Fair Sir, we are good men and true, but in much miſery and great trouble for the nonce. Have pity on us for the ſake of the Virgin Queen. The ſnow falls faſt; we have toiled our weary way ſo long and far that our ſhoes are utterly worn out, and our bleeding feet are freezing to the ground. Open, I pray you, maidens ſweet, leſt you would behold a band of pilgrims periſh from deſtitution at your doors.

Bazoulan. Ah, ah! and you think to come round us with your quirks ſo eaſily! Away with ye, thieves and robbers as ye are! Carry your idle tales elſewhere, for we are upon our guard, and ye come not within our doors to-night. (This firm

aſſeveration was received with a ſhout of applauſe from the valorous defenders.)

Bridegroom. Take pity on us ſtill, kind Sirs, though your ſharp wit has perceived we are not pilgrims as we aſſumed to be. We are honeſt labourers, who have had the ill-luck to find ſome game on the ſquire's preſerves; the keepers and the conſtables are in hot purſuit of us, and cloſe upon our heels, and ſhould you not admit us we ſhall linger out the remainder of our days in jail.

Bazoulan. How know we that ye are what ye ſay? You have told us one untruth already.

Bridegroom. Open a window or a door, and we will ſhow you the fat buck we have killed.

Bazoulan. Are you there with your ſchemes, my maſter? Not quite ſuch a fool as that, though! Show me the game, that I may ſee the truth of what ye ſay.

At this point of the diſcuſſion a young man of great height and herculean form came forth from the group, and lifted up to the loft-door a heavy iron ſpit, on the top of which a plucked and roaſted gooſe was impaled, ornamented with ſeveral devices of ſtraw and ribbons interweaved. The *Bazoulan*, however, was not to be betrayed into any demonſtration of confidence by opening the loft-door through which the aſſailants might have entered by a *coup-de-main*, but he quietly paſſed his arm out of the round air-hole through which he had been ſpeaking, affected to touch the gooſe with his hand, cried out that it was neither buck, nor doe, nor partridge, quail nor rabbit, and indignantly bade

the beſiegers carry their falſe ſayings to ſome other market.

This was ſuppoſed to tax the temper of the bride-groom over much; the ſpit and gooſe were inſtantly withdrawn; the herald announced that ſince the doors were not opened to them of free good-will, they would fight their way in forthwith; the bride-groom's band raiſed a ſhout of exultation at the courſe propoſed, another volley of fire-arms rent the air, the *Bazoulan* laughed deriſively, cloſed the little trap-door with a bang, and ſcrambled down the ſtairs to the kitchen; whereupon the youths and maidens joined hand-in-hand, ſtamping and dancing to their own voices; the parents of the bride and their attendants ſcreamed defiance to the invaders with all the power of their ſhrilly lungs. On the other hand, the beſiegers pretended to be imbued with all the ferocity incidental to a night-aſſault upon a town devoted to the atrocities of pillage; they fired innocuous blank cartridges through the locks, battered the walls with heavy beams of wood, ſhook the outſide blinds with the greateſt violence, ſhouting all the while with the greateſt energy, but ſtill the garriſon made good their defence, and the fortreſs was intact. Had any one of the bride-groom's party been able to penetrate through an unguarded avenue into the houſe, and place the ſpit upon the hearth, the *Bazoulan* would have ſurrendered at diſcretion, the bride been yielded up, a willing captive, to her future lord, and the play been effectually played out; but in this inſtance no precaution had been neglected, and, amidſt all the

duſt, excitement, noiſe, and ſmoke, no one dared to violate the uſages that had been handed down for centuries from ſire to ſon, until the preciſe moment for reſorting to friendly force ſhould have arrived.

At length the ſimulation of aſſault was thought to have been carried far and long enough; the herald of the bridegroom's party called a truce, the *Bazoulan* accepted it, and, mounting again to his old poſt in the granary, taunted his enemies with their failure in attacking his fortified poſition, and then, affecting to take pity upon them, propoſed terms, by a ſtrict compliance with which they ſhould gain admittance into the farmhouſe. Thus was the convention entered into—

Bridegroom. What muſt we do to gain admiſſion to your hearth? Speak, noble commandant.

Bazoulan. You muſt ſing a verſe or a line of a ſong unknown to us in this houſe, and which none in it can go on with in reply.

Bridegroom. Be it ſo, my friends; and now for the trial of our ſkill:—"Six months ago, in the ſweet ſpring-time——"

"As I roamed o'er the meads ſo green," the *Bazoulan* broke in with a ſtentorian voice. Why, fellow, you are laughing at us when you ſing ſuch a common ſtrain.

Bridegroom. "A bonnie maiden of high degree——"

Bazoulan. "Fell in love with a lowly youth." Paſs on to another, good man, for we ſtop you in that at the very firſt line.

Bridegroom. Will this do, then? "From the market of Nantes, as I returned——"

Bazoulan. "Tired to death with the wearifome way." As old as our grandmothers! Something newer, I pray you.

Bridegroom. "Adown the banks of the golden Loire——"

Bazoulan. "With Phyllis as I ftrayed." Go to, go to; the little children fing it at our doors.

In this manner the cantatory ftrife lafted a full hour, and poffibly might have endured throughout the night, for the antagonifts were admirably fkilled in thefe ancient lays chanted by "the fpinfters and the knitters in the fun," their memories were wonderfully accurate and their repertories feemed inexhauftible. Occafionally the *Bazoulan* would permit his opponents to go through twenty or thirty verfes of fome old romance without interruption, and then, when the bridegroom and his companions were congratulating themfelves upon their victory, he would come in with the firft line of the laft ftrophe, and jeeringly tell the finger that he need not fatigue himfelf again with finging fo long a fong. The bridegroom perceived at laft that he could not win, fo he acknowledged himfelf vanquifhed with a good grace, and the adverfe groups proceeded to the "Chaunt of the *Livrées*," which is always fung in folemn, dirge-like time. It commences in the following manner by the baffes without the houfe:—

> "Open, Marie, for a hufband young
> Cometh thy love to win;

The rain falls faſt, and the winds blow cold,
Open, and let him in."

To which the women in the interior replied:—

"My father's away, and my mother in bed—
I prithee no longer ſtay;
You cannot come in at this hour of the night,
Germain, go hence away!"

The men then took up their firſt three lines of the firſt verſe, varying the fourth line by naming one of the preſents—a neckerchief, &c.—that the bridegroom had prepared for his beloved, until the whole of the articles compoſing the humble *corbeille* of the bride were gone through—ribbons, aprons, a gold croſs, dreſſes, laces, and even pies; but ſtill the matrons remained inexorable until the brideſmen had recourſe to the firſt couplet again, when, at the mention of the word "huſband," all the females uttered a ſimultaneous cry; and it was decided that the bridegroom ſhould come in.

Immediately the "defenders of the hearth" ranged themſelves acroſs the room immediately oppoſite the door, the girls withdrew with the bride to another room; the farmer, his dame, and her goſſips, formed a *corps de reſerve* before the fire-place, the *Bazoulan* removed the light croſs-bar of wood that faſtened the door, threw it wide open, and the aſſailants ruſhed tumultuouſly, ſpeaking in military faſhion, into the body of the place.

The point of honour involving the victory was to place the gooſe upon the hearth; ſo the ſtandard-bearer, ſurrounded by his body-guard, ſtrove manfully to gain his object, and the champions of the

defence battled as luſtily to defeat his end. With the exception of abſtaining from blows given with the clenched fiſt or open hand, it was, to all intents and purpoſes, a veritable combat; the young men exerted their muſcular powers to the fulleſt extent in accompliſhing their object; they puſhed, wreſtled, ſtruggled, and occaſionally threw each other down; ſome at times were preſſed ſo hard againſt the wall that they could ſcarcely breathe; the hands of ſeveral bled freely from coming in rude contact with the ſharp-pointed ſpit, which bent like an aſpen twig within the vigorous graſp of both the aſſailants and defenders; until in accordance with a preconcerted plan the bridegroom's herald ſtole unobſerved from the room during the "ſteady current of the fight," mounted the ſtairs to the loft, ſecured the door, ſcrambled upon the roof, deſcended the wide chimney without being perceived by the garriſon, whoſe backs were neceſſarily placed towards it; and as at the very moment he appeared the tall ſtandard-bearer tore his ſpit with one gigantic effort from the hands of thoſe who clutched it, and extended it above their heads towards the herald, the latter ſnatched the gooſe from off it, and, with a yell of triumph, placed it upon the hearth.

As with the magic wave of an enchanter's wand the noiſy ſtrife was huſhed. The goal was gained, the ſhaft had hit its mark, and the gooſe reſted peacefully upon the hearth between the maſſive andirons where none dared to touch it. One of them ſeized a ſmall ſheaf of ſtraw, placed a few ſtalks round the bird, and lighted them, making pretence

to roaſt it, according to the infallible routine preſcribed on theſe occaſions.

In the meantime, four low figures, dreſſed alike in white like ſheeted ghoſts, were ſmuggled myſteriouſly into one corner of the room ſurrounded by the bride's godmother, her aunts, and the other girls, placed upon a bench, where they were inſtantly covered with a large white cloth. Theſe "phantoms pale" were the bride and three of her young companions ſelected from their being preciſely of the ſame ſtature as herſelf; and the peaks of their caps of ceremony were adjuſted exactly to the ſame height, the object being to render it impoſſible for the bridegroom to diſtinguiſh one from the other of the girls in the further trial he was to undergo before he ſhould be deemed to have fairly won his bride.

Theſe preparations being made, the *Bazoulan* marſhalled all the young men in a ſemicircle with the bridegroom in the centre, ſomewhat in advance, and marched them ſlowly towards the bench on which the girls were ſeated. Arrived there, he placed a ſmall oſier ſwitch in the bridegroom's hand, directing him to touch with it the figure beneath the cloth he thought his future wife, informing him at the ſame time that if he were ſucceſsful on the firſt eſſay he would be entitled to lead off the ball with her, and be her partner without change; but if he failed he muſt remain contented with dancing with other maidens through the night.

After a ſlight heſitation the enamoured farmer recommended himſelf to his patron ſaint, extended

the wand, and had the happineſs to touch the bride's forehead; ſhe immediately threw the cloth from her, and was led by him into the centre of the room to commence the dance, which laſted without intermiſſion until the bell of the village clock ſtruck midnight, and then all the gueſts withdrew to their reſpective homes.

At eight o'clock the following morning the parties invited to the marriage aſſembled, arrayed in all their beſt, at the bridegroom's farm, and all having partaken of a hearty breakfaſt, the bridegroom proceeded to the bride's houſe, and led back his bluſhing bride in triumph to his own. The *cortége* was then formed, headed by a band of rural muſicians, and proceeded to the church.

The religious rites differed in no wiſe from thoſe invariably performed at weddings, except that at a particular period of the ſervice the bridegroom placed thirteen pieces of ſilver in the bride's hand; this ceremony is ſtyled "the Offering." The proceſſion then returned to the bridegroom's farm, where a ſubſtantial liberal repaſt was prepared, and dancing, ſinging, and ruſtic games conſtituted the feſtivities until the witching hour of night again ſummoned the revellers to depart.

On the third morning of theſe peculiar cuſtoms the friends and relations of the newly-married couple met at breakfaſt, and then commenced the ceremony of "the cabbage," the moſt ſingular of all the primitive cuſtoms of Lorraine: it was the crowning ceremony of the myſtic "cabbage." A rural band of muſicians marched at the head of the

proceſſion at a ſtately, funereal pace, towards the kitchen-garden of the young wife's parents. Next came the "gardener," carrying a ſpade and wicker-baſket filled with earth, ſeated in a hand-barrow, borne on the ſhoulders of four ſtrong men; his wife followed, accompanied by the elders of the village, and then came the gueſts who were bidden to the wedding, two and two. When the garden was attained, the beds of cabbages were carefully inſpected, the council of the ancients was held to determine the ſuperiority of the plants; and when one of Patagonian dimenſions was ſelected, the "Pagan" attached his cord to the ſtem, and retired as far back as the extent of the rope would permit him, whilſt the "wife" remained by the "cabbage" to guard againſt its ſuſtaining injury in its removal from the boſom of its mother earth.

During this operation, which was conducted with the greateſt care, ſo as not to injure the cabbage-roots, the viſitors and children amuſed themſelves with pelting each other, in a jocular manner, with ſmall clods of earth, ſtyled the "baptiſm of the ſoil," which every perſon muſt go through at weddings, were he a biſhop or prince of the blood royal; and at the end of a quarter of an hour, at a given ſignal, the "gardener" pulled the cord, and the cabbage was received unharmed in the "wife's" apron, amidſt the vociferous ſhouts of the ſpectators.

The baſket was then brought, and the cabbage planted in it with the utmoſt mock ſolemnity; the earth was preſſed gently round its roots. It was

ſuſtained in a perfectly upright poſition by three ſticks, tied with baſs, in the ſame way as floriſts ſupport their choiceſt flowers; roſy-cheeked apples, on the tops of other ſticks, and ſprigs of thyme and laurel, covered with ribbons and little flags, were ſtuck around it, and it was placed in the barrow, which was again hoiſted on the men's ſhoulders, whilſt the "Pagan" walked by the ſide, to ſee that no miſhap befell it in its tranſmiſſion to the bridegroom's houſe.

But when the proceſſion arrived at the bridegroom's door, an imaginary obſtacle to their entrance preſented itſelf. The bearers of the barrow feigned to tremble and bend beneath their burden, and to come to a ſudden halt, then they advanced and recoiled, as if ſome powerful but inviſible hand repelled them; whilſt the gueſts uttered words of advice and encouragement, ſuch as "Gently now, lads,—the gate is too narrow. A little to the right! Now with a will, and altogether! that's it!" &c.

This is typical of the laſt load of wheat of an abundant harveſt, ſtyled the *gerbande*, crowned with flowers and ribbons, being drawn by the oxen from the field, and paſſing with difficulty through the triumphal arch at the entrance of the farmer's full ſtack-yard.

When this obſtacle was ſuppoſed to be overcome the "Pagan" looked around him attentively to find the higheſt point of the premiſes—chimney, dovecot, or gable-end—on which he was bound to place the baſket with the cabbage, at the riſk of even breaking his neck in the attempt. In this inſtance

the roof of the houſe was attained; and the earth in the baſket having been moiſtened with a jug of wine, the cabbage was left to the influence of the ſkies, with a final ſhout and the diſcharge of all the fire-arms in the band.

Similar forms were obſerved in digging up and tranſplanting a vegetable from the bridegroom's garden, and carrying it to the former reſidence of his wife; for much importance is attached to the flouriſhing or immediate decadence of the humble plant, as in it is involved, according to the matronly legendary lore, the happineſs of the newly-married pair, in ſo far as it may be conſtituted by the preſence of numerous future little ſmiling faces round their ample hearth.

What are we to ſay of this curious and comprehenſive rural wedding? That it is eſſentially a village ceremony is the main feature of its characteriſtics. We have here in this one ſingle example the bride-capture, where the village took the part of the bride or the bridegroom; we have the ſignificant defence of the hearth, and, if I miſtake not, the ſacrifice of the gooſe there; we have the bride-price; we have the defence of the bridegroom's threſhold; we have the "baptiſm of ſoil," and the peculiar ceremony of the cabbage which initiated the bride into her new home. All this is ſet forth in peculiar exactitude, and it helps to reclaim to their loſt home the many fragments into which the village marriage in England has been broken by the courſe of ages.

How clearly all theſe cuſtoms may be reſolved into a ſpecies of village law, and hence as relics of early village law, may be ſeen by a glance at ſome of the rural laws of courtſhip and marriage in ſome of the leſs important European States. Thus we are told that "they are by no means the ſame throughout Bavaria. Indeed, each diſtrict, and ſometimes each village, has its own matrimonial code, as it has its eſpecial ſumptuary laws, and its inhabitants would no more venture to defy the one than they would dare to infringe the other. But a certain ſimilarity of ideas pervades the whole arrangement. In the firſt place, the bride is not ſuppoſed to be an active, ſcarcely a conſenting party in the negotiations, which are indeed of a moſt buſineſs-like kind, and are uſually committed by the bridegroom to a perſon hired for the purpoſe—a profeſſional beſt-man, whoſe office, the inſignia of which is a hooked ſtick, is to obtain the bride and her dowry, to invite the gueſts to the wedding, alſo to obtain from them as many gifts as poſſible for the new *ménage*, and the courſe of the feſtivities on the days both preceding and following the marriage, for wedding feaſts in rural Bavaria ſometimes drag their long courſe over a whole week. A very common preliminary of marriage in theſe diſtricts is for the lover or his beſt-man to offer the maiden a cup of wine. If ſhe accepts, which ſhe never does except under proteſt, her conſent is conſidered to be given. It is thought a ſpecial ſign of ill-luck if any of the wine is ſpilt on this occaſion. It is alſo a common ſuperſtition that it is unlucky for a girl to accept an offer of

marriage made under a roof, ſo the would-be bridegroom, or his repreſentative, has to catch her with his beaker of wine in the open. Before the marriage is decided on, a viſit of inſpection is made to the houſes of the bride and bridegroom's relatives by the parents of each. This is a very ſolemn matter, and involves not only the future of the young couples, but the credit of two entire families, and an amount of ſcrubbing and ſcouring, mending and ſetting to rights, which we can but dimly imagine, and which certainly does much to try both the ſinews and the tempers of the two future mothers-in-law. During theſe viſits it is uſual for the beſt-man to be in attendance, and to enliven the ſcene by a running commentary on the bleſſings and advantages of the life matrimonial."

There is not much more to ſay now of theſe cuſtoms of to-day and of days far back in the paſt. The relics of early village life which I have attempted to collect together in theſe pages in illuſtration of the many remarkable parallels between Engliſh folk-lore and ſavage cuſtom have conſiſtently borne towards one centre point—the building up of the old Aryan houſe-faith. As in agricultural matters nature-worſhip gave way to the houſe-religion, ſo in ſocial matters the communal marriage gave way to the family marriage, and that, too, through the influence of the houſe religion. The remarkable grouping of marriage cuſtoms proclaims that the houſe-faith penetrated into the old communal life, and eſtabliſhed a point beyond which community of life was not to go. The village rites

of the marriage ceremony as gathered together in this chapter are purely ſocial in all their aſpects; the link that connects them with the religious marriage ceremony of to-day (with which they have apparently ſo little to do) is that portion of the ancient rite which was enacted before the houſe-altar, the ſacred hearth; and this portion was wrung from the purely communiſtic life of primitive man by the encroachment of the worſhip of the domeſtic hearth, the chiefeſt and brighteſt feature in early village life. If, therefore, theſe ſhort chapters of a very important and extenſive ſubject enable us to give a certain diſtinctiveneſs to our retroſpection of ages long ſince gone by, if with the fragments we have examined and placed together, we have been able to reſtore a moſaic-like portion of the picture of paſt times, there appears to be very good ground for hoping that ſtill further reſearches into the subjects here dealt with, and into ſubjects not dealt with though equally belonging to early village life, will enable us gradually to complete and make perfect a portion of hiſtory which has hitherto been loſt to us. But it muſt ever be borne in mind that this hiſtory has no other records than what it has received from the undying memories, the ſteadfaſt faith, the ſuperſtitious reverence of generation after generation who have remembered and believed and feared all that their fathers had remembered and believed and feared.

INDEX.

ABYSSINIAN cuſtoms, 80.
Afghan cuſtom, 220.
African cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions, 18, 87-88, 104, 110, 114, 119, 154, 180, 183, 196, 198-9, 211.
Agni, god of fire, 91.
Agriculture, houſe gods as gods of, 124-151.
Alfriſton church, legend of, 45.
American Indian cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions, 64, 80, 89, 97, 114, 117, 153, 156, 158, 171, 200-201.
Anceſtors, worſhip of deceaſed, 85.
Andamaners, cuſtoms of, 197.
Anglo-Saxon cuſtoms, 138-142, 188.
Animal ſacrifice, 116, 118, 119, 120.
Arrowheads, flint, uſed in ſavage ſociety, 5.
Aryan folk-lore, 124-6.
Aſhes, divination by, 95.
Aſſins, houſe-burial among, 114.
Athlone, cuſtom at, 76.
Auſtralian cuſtoms, 154, 193-196.

Banns of marriage, 214.
Baſſam, Great, foundation ſacrifice in, 25.
Baſutos, cuſtoms of, 110, 127.
Bees, death of owner told to, 137.
Birth cuſtoms, 107-113, 137, 166-167, 178-180.
Black Mountain cuſtoms, 134, 160.
Boddus, Hebrides evil ſpirit, 100.
Boggart, 100.
Breedon church, legend on building of, 43.
Bride-cake, 81.
—— capture, 204-210, 224-230.
—— price, 220.
Bridewains, 213.
Brownies, 94.
Brownsover church, ſkeleton found in, 35.
Brûd, fairy ſo called, 95.
Building a houſe, ceremony of, 60-62.
Bundling, cuſtom ſo called, 220.

Burial (houſe-), 113-117.
Burmah, foundation ſacrifice in, 28.
Burn, charm for, 176.
Burnley Croſs and the demon pigs, legend of, 43-44.

Cabbage, ceremony of the, 233.
Californian cuſtoms, 104.
Cambridgeſhire, ſkeleton found in Snailwell church, 36.
Candlemas day cuſtom, 95.
Caſhel, rock of, legend of, 40-41.
Celtic land deities, 130.
Ceylon cuſtoms, 197.
Changeling (fairy), 112-113.
Charm, New Zealand, 128, 175.
Cheſt, the family, 158-160.
Chicken ſacrifice, 26.
Chimney, uſed in folk medicine, 120.
Chineſe cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions, 78, 80, 103, 117, 178, 181, 220.
Chriſtmas day cuſtoms, 99, 133-136, 143. See "Yule."
Church-building legends, 41-48.
—— foundations, ſkeletons found, 35, 36.
Civilization, 73.
Claſſification of folk-lore, 10.
Clavie, feſtival of the, 98.
Clegg Hall, Lancaſhire, legend of, 48-49.
Cluricaun, 100.
Coal, live, for heating water at birth, 167.
Cock, ſacrifice of, 26, 49.
Communiſm in living, 153-158.
Cooking cuſtoms, 165-172.
Corn, divination as to price of, 145-146.
Corniſh ſuperſtitions and cuſtoms, 69, 96, 117.
Cradle ſuperſtition, 180-181.
Cumberland, courtſhip in, 79.
—— houſe building in, 23.
Cymhortha, cuſtom ſo called among the Welſh, 157.

Dahomans, houſe burial among, 114.
Daubing cuſtoms, 219.
Dayak cuſtoms, 25, 26.
Death in houſe, 64, 70.
Death of owner told to yoke horſes, 137.
Dēmēter, worſhip of, 130.
Devonſhire cuſtoms, 37-39, 175.
Diſeaſe, cures of, 117-121.
Divination by aſhes, 95.
Domeſtic cuſtoms, 152-184.
Drayton's "Nymphidia," quoted, 92.
Dumfrieſhire, houſe building in, 22.

Ears, ringing ſound in, 177.
Earth, god of the, 17.
—— deities, 127-132.
Eaſter Sunday, fires not allowed to go out, 97.
Eſquimaux cuſtoms, 168.
Eſſex legend, 41, 42.
Ethelbert, reception of Auguſtine, 68.

Fairies, entrance into houſe prevented, 77.
Fairy lore, 91-95.
Family, Aryan, 126.
Family god. See "Houſe."
Fantees, houſe burial among, 114.

Fauſſet collection of antiquities, 5.
Feet-waſhing at marriages, 219.
Field deities, 130.
Fijian cuſtoms, 29, 80, 114, 169.
Fire (houſehold) worſhip, 85-123.
—— carried round houſes, &c., 147.
Folk-lore, ſcientific aſpect of, 2-12.
Font (new) baptiſm at, is fatal, 36.
Food, common right to, 153-158.
Foot (right) ſuperſtition, 183.
Foundation ſacrifice, 24-58, 126.
France, foundation ſacrifice in, 26.

Galam, human ſacrifice in, 27.
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 32.
Ghoſt ſtory, 37-39.
Gift at marriage, 216-217.
Gilds, primitive origin of, 155.
Glouceſterſhire cuſtoms, 147.
Goblin, 100.
—— builders, legend of, 44-45.
Goods, common holding of, 153-158, 187.
Greeks, ſacredneſs of threſhold among, 74.
—— birth ceremonies, 107.
—— marriage cuſtoms, 190-191.

Hair, ſuperſtitions connected with, 173-175.
Hare, meeting a, 183.
Harveſt cuſtoms, 144-145.
Hawaii cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions, 21, 62, 118, 170.
Heart, embalmed, buried in wall, 39.
Hearth, worſhip at, 85.
Hearthſtone, burial of bottle of pins under, 37.
Hebrew cuſtom, 150.
Hephaeſtus, the Greek god, 88.
Herefordſhire cuſtom, 137, 147.
Herrick (Robert) quoted, 83, 99.
Hills, the abode of fairies, 17.
Hindu cuſtoms, &c., 17, 28-29, 60, 62, 72, 90, 104-105, 126, 136, 138, 143-144, 146, 149, 155, 159, 173, 179, 197, 208, 211, 219, 220.
Homeſtead, occupation of, 59-71.
Horſe-ſhoe, nailed at threſhold, 78.
Hottentots, cuſtoms, 168.
Houſe in early ſociety, 148, 150.
—— building of, 21-23.
—— foundation ſacrifice, 24-58.
—— ſuperſtitions connected with building, 59-71.
Houſe-religion, 72-123.
—— influence of, on agricultural deities, 131-151.
—— on marriage rites, 189.
Houſe-warming, 156.
Human ſacrifice, 25, 27, 28, 31-33, 132.

Indian beliefs or ſuperſtitions. See "American," "Hindu."
Inveraven Caſtle, legend of, 46.
Invitation to weddings, 211, 223.
Iriſh cuſtoms, 135, 161, 165, 166, 204, 213, 215, 217.
Iron knife, ſuperſtitions concerning, 163.

Japan, family gods in, 88.
—— foundation ſacrifice in, 27-28.
Johnſon (Dr.), ſuperſtitious practice by, 183.
Journey, ſtarting on, ſuperſtition concerning, 183.

Kaffir ſuperſtitions and cuſtoms, 64, 154.
Kelly's "Curioſities of Indo-European folk-lore," 3.
Kern baby, 145.
Khands, deities of, 132.
Kobbold, 100.

Ladder, unlucky to go under, 8.
Lanarkſhire cuſtoms, 99.
Lancaſhire cuſtoms, 23, 163.
Land cuſtom, 138-144.
—— in early ſociety, 149.
—— deities, 127-132.
Lang (A.), on the ſtudy of folk-lore, 4-6.
Lapland cuſtoms, 106, 183.
Leiceſterſhire church building legend, 43.
Lithuania, domeſtic god in, 90.
Log feſtivals, 133-136.
Lorraine, marriage ceremony in, 222-236.
Lyme Regis, ſelling of wood aſhes at, 99.

Madagaſcar cuſtoms, 62, 65, 108-110, 134, 169, 171, 199.
Manorial cuſtoms, 155, 201-202.
Magic in buildings, 68.
Man, Iſle of, cuſtoms, 67, 77, 95, 97, 135.
Marriage cuſtoms, 79-84, 102-106, 185-239.
Maulai, death ceremonies among the, 115.
May Day cuſtoms, 98.
Meal, common, 155.
Medicine, folk-, 117-121.
Meg Merrilies, 70.
Merlin, tradition of, 31-33.
Mortars and peſtles, 164.

Nature worſhip, 126.
Neolithic man, houſe burial among, 115.
New Zealand cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions, 27, 50, 63, 64, 74, 86, 88, 96, 104, 114, 128, 132, 158, 172, 173, 175, 176.
Nicobar iſlanders, houſe building of, 61.
—— houſe gods, 89.
Norfolk cuſtoms, 147.
Northamptonſhire cuſtoms, 175.
Northumberland cuſtoms, 84.

Oak, felling of, 17.
Oran, traditional ſacrifice of, 33.
Oriſſa, houſe-building in, 61.
Ovaherorò, cuſtoms of, 119, 134-136.
Overchurch, legend of, 46-48.

Petted ſtone, 84.
Peruvian cuſtoms, 114, 196.
Picts, foundation ſacrifice among, 30.
Pigeon, ſtuffed, in cure of diſeaſe, 119.
Pins in witchcraft, 120.
Pipe, unlucky to give light for, 98.
Ploughing cuſtoms, 137, 140, 143, 144.
Plough Monday, 147-148.
Poles, marriage cuſtom of, 106.

Polynefian cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions, 17, 18, 27, 76, 85, 104, 171, 173, 177, 183.
Pounding of corn, 163-164.

Quern, 164.

Rice thrown over bride's head, 80.
Robin Goodfellow, 92, 93.
Roman, ancient, cuſtoms, 77, 107.
Roumanian legend, 51-57.

St. Botulf, legend of, 129-130.
St. Bridget, cuſtom connected with, 77.
St. Columba, tradition of, 33.
St. Guthlac, legend of, 128-129.
St. Oſwald, legend of, 43.
St. Patrick, legend of, 40-41.
Samoans, houſe ſacred to family god, 85.
—— fire kindled at death, 115.
Samoyeds, folk-tales of, 5.
Scotland, cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions of, 120, 130, 143, 145, 156, 164, 165, 166, 174, 179, 181, 182, 207, 209, 212.
Scrambling, cuſtom of, at birth, 109.
Settlement of the village, 16-23.
Shetland cuſtoms, 163.
Short-bread, plate of, thrown over bride's head, 80-81.
Shropſhire cuſtoms, 147.
Siam, foundation ſacrifice in, 28.
Siberia, cuſtoms in, 103.
Site of village, choice of, 127.
Skeleton found in church foundations, 35, 36.
Snailwell church, ſkeleton found in, 36.
Somerſetſhire ſuperſtition, 120.
South Sea iſlanders, 170.
Spider omen, 177.
Sports and games at marriages, 215.
Stone-boiling, 166-168.
Stones, folk-lore of, 160.
Survival, the doctrine of, 3-6.
Suſſex cuſtoms, 37, 82, 174, 181.

Tables, put away, at Chriſtmas time, 160.
Temple in Teutonic mythology, 17.
Threſhold, ſuperſtitions concerning, 75-85.
Toothache charm, 175, 180.
Torches uſed at funerals, 117.
Trees, place of, in religious ſyſtems, 17-18.
—— ſuperſtition reſpecting cutting down of, 149.
Trouſers, fathers', to protect child from fairies, 182.

Udimore church, legend of, 45-46.

Vancouver Iſland cuſtoms and ſuperſtitions, 64, 105, 169, 171, 198.
Victoria, aborigines of, ſuperſtitions of, 90.
Village community, typical inſtance of, 12-14.

Waldron church, legend of, 45.
Wales, cuſtoms, 205, 220.
Warwickſhire, ſkeleton found in Brownſover church, 35.
Wendover church, legend of, 45.

Wiltſhire cuſtom, 166.
Witchcraft, protection of threſhold from, 78.
Woman, ill luck at meeting, 183.
Word charm, 175.

Yoke-horſes, death of owner told to, 137.
Yorkſhire cuſtoms, 36, 82, 179, 181, 206.
Yule log, 99.
Yule tide cuſtoms, 133-136, 143.

Zulu beliefs or ſuperſtitions. See "African."

HW 3606 N

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED THE COST OF OVERDUE NOTIFICATION IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW.

BOOK DUE WID

DEC 20 1980

CANCELLED